

Received Comments

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

Cl 0 SC 0 P L # I-90  
 Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D MAY  
 " Removal of a PME from an operationally "up" EFMCu port, aggregating several PMEs, may cause the port's rate degradation." "mau cause" is stating a consequence (fact). Which is not correct use of "may".  
*SuggestedRemedy*  
 Change to:  
 Removal of a PME from an operationally "up" EFMCu port, aggregating several PMEs, might result in rate degradation on the port.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 3 SC 3 P22 L37 # I-28  
 Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D 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 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 "slot";" is a characteristic of a module not part of defining the term.  
*SuggestedRemedy*  
 Delete everything except: "In the context of the MIB definitions, a specification of management capabilities related to the system." as this is the only part appropriate to clause 3.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 5 SC 5.4 P30 L64 # I-29  
 Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D MAY  
 The use of "may" in a footnote is incorrect. "may" is normative. in particular defining an action within the limits (scope) of this standard. Users of this standard are not within the scope of this standard. What we mean with this is to grant permission. Which can be stated more clearly without abusing "may". Also fix this on pate 91.  
*SuggestedRemedy*  
 Change to: Users of this standard are granted permission to freely y reproduce the MIB module contained in this subclause so that it can be used for its intended purpose. Make the same change on page 91 footnote. Make this same change on Page 132 footnote. Make this same change on Page 449 footnote  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.

The text of the footnote is informative (Style Manual, 2020, section 18.2) and not 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.  
 No changes were made.

Cl 6 SC 6.2.2 P86 L63 # I-30  
 Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D MAY  
 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.

Received Comments

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

Cl 6 SC 6.5 P91 L11 # I-31  
 Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D MAY  
 "may not" is never correct in an IEEE standard. Here it is meant to describe a possible outcome or consequence of an action.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 change : "may not" to "might not".  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 6 SC 6.5 P91 L13 # I-32  
 Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D MAY  
 "may not" is never correct in an IEEE standard. Here it is meant to describe a possible outcome or consequence of an action.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 change : "may not" to "might not".  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 6 SC 6.6.2 P97 L53 # I-33  
 Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D MAY  
 "may be used on that link" sounds a lot like stating what is possible, and this sentence doesn't define an action within the scope of this standard.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 change "may be used on that link" to "are available on that link".  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 6 SC 6.6.2 P98 L1 # I-34  
 Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D MAY  
 "Note that the object ifOperStatus may not be up(1) as a result of link failure or administrative action " the "note that" is a clue this is stating a possibility, not an optional requirement (misuse of "may").  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change to: Note that the object ifOperStatus might be other than up(1) as a result of link failure or administrative action  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 6 SC 6.6.2 P107 L50 # I-35  
 Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D MAY  
 "given the possibility that a frame may be lost in transit." - use of "the possibility" is a strong hint this is stating a possibility, not an optional requirement.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change "may" to "might".  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 6 SC 6.6.2 P108 L15 # I-36  
 Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D MAY  
 "given the possibility that a frame may be lost in transit." - use of "the possibility" is a strong hint this is stating a possibility, not an optional requirement.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change "may" to "might".  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Received Comments

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

Cl 6 SC 6.6.2 P108 L45 # I-37  
 Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D MAY  
 "given the possibility that a frame may be lost in transit." - use of "the possibility" is a strong hint this is stating a possibility, not an optional requirement.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change "may" to "might".  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 6 SC 6.6.2 P109 L8 # I-38  
 Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D MAY  
 "given the possibility that a frame may be lost in transit." - use of "the possibility" is a strong hint this is stating a possibility, not an optional requirement.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change "may" to "might".  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 6 SC 6.6.2 P112 L34 # I-39  
 Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D MAY  
 " there may be cases where frames are dropped due to transmit resource contention. " is stating a possibility, not a permissible (optional) requirement defined in this standard.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change "may" to "might".  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 6 SC 6.6.2 P112 L37 # I-40  
 Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D MAY  
 Here it is less than clear if we're saying it is permissible (within the scope of this standard) to drop a frame, or if this is suggesting a possibility outside the scope of this standard, as suggested by the "note that" (suggesting this is informative, not normative). So going with informative.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 change "may" to "might"  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 6 SC 6.6.2 P120 L49 # I-41  
 Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D MAY  
 "which may result in locally generated OAMPDUs" defines a permissible action within the scope of this standard. Where is that behavior defined? A cross reference where local generation of OAMPDUs 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.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 add a reference to where local generation of OAMPDUs is defined in this standard or in a normative reference.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Replace text "which may result in locally generated OAMPDUs" with "potentially resulting in locally generated OAMPDUs".

Received Comments

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

CI 6 SC 6.6.2 P121 L6 # [-42]  
 Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D MAY  
 Is this stating a possibility, or an optional requirement? Where is the adjustment process or procedure defined? Use of technically incomplete term "other information" suggests this is stating a possibility, not a requirement, though it is not clear which is intended. Going with the informative note guess.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 change "may" to "can" or "often will".  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Change "may" to "can"

CI 6 SC 6.6.2 P122 L6 # [-43]  
 Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D MAY  
 As this is defining an optional requirement (permissible action within the limits (scope) of this standard), where is "other information" defined in this standard? Perhaps the intent is to state the possibility of an action that might happen but is not defined in this standard. Then "may" is wrong.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 change "may" to "might"  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 6 SC 6.6.2 P125 L17 # [-44]  
 Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D MAY  
 "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.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change sentence to: "For threshold crossing events when multiple occurrences cross the threshold, the number of events and the number of resultant Event Notifications are likely to be different."  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

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."  
 CI 6 SC 6.6.2 P125 L45 # [-45]  
 Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D MAY  
 "since multiple occurrences may be required to cross the threshold," is stating a possibility, and so is misuse of "may".  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change "may" to "can". Clarify to which values "these values" refer.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

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."

Received Comments

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

CI 7 SC 7.1.1 P131 L23 # [-46]  
 Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates  
 Comment 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 technically complete ;-)  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 change "may" to "might"  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 7 SC 7.1.3.2 P132 L25 # [-47]  
 Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D MAY  
 Use of normative language in an informative note: "NOTE—When a network management entity is observing a repeater, it may appear as though the repeater is passing packets to a higher level protocol entity. However, this is only a means of implementing management, and this passing of management information is not part of the repeater functionality."  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change to (not be wrong): NOTE—When a network management entity is observing a 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  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 7 SC 7.3.2 P139 L11 # [-48]  
 Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D MAY  
 " 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.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 change "may" to "might"  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 7 SC 7.3.2 P140 L1 # [-49]  
 Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D MAY  
 "Some ports may not be present in the repeater system" is incorrect use of "may". Stating a possible condition, not an action within the scope of this standard.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 change "may" to "might"  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 7 SC 7.3.2 P141 L13 # [-50]  
 Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D MAY  
 Misuse of "may".  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 change to " This identifies the port independently from the repeater to which it is attached  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Received Comments

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

Cl 7 SC 7.3.2 P142 L30 # I-51  
 Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D MAY  
 "(note this may or may not be possible depending on the type of port.)" has "note that" "may or may not", and "possible" all wrapped as a parenthetical - all clues this is informative not normative.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change to: Note that for some port types it is not possible to physically remove the port.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 7 SC 7.3.2 P144 L34 # I-52  
 Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D MAY  
 " the implementor may choose to delay the reset long enough to allow the SNMP response to be transmitted." well the implementer is always outside the limits of this standard, so we can't prescribe requirements, even optional ones, on the implementer. Perhaps on the implementation. I don't thin this is what the group means because the entire paragraph seems to be informative Thus my guess:  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 change to: For example, it is possible, and may be desired, to delay the reset to allow the SNMP response to be transmitted.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Changed "For example, the implementor may choose to delay the reset long enough to allow the SNMP response to be transmitted." to "For example, it is possible to delay the reset to allow the SNMP response to be transmitted."

Cl 7 SC 7.3.2 P144 L50 # I-53  
 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.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 change to: Packets received during the test can be but are not required to be transferred  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Changed "Packets received during the test may or may not be transferred." to "Packets received during the test can be transferred."

Cl 7 SC 7.3.2 P147 L13 # I-54  
 Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D MAY  
 "A discontinuity may occur in the value when the value of object rptrMonitorPortLastChange changes" is stating a possibility.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 change "may" to "can"  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 7 SC 7.3.2 P147 L43 # I-55  
 Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D MAY  
 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.

Received Comments

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

CI 7 SC 7.3.2 P148 L20 # I-56  
 Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D MAY  
 "A discontinuity may occur in the value when the value of object rptrMonitorPortLastChange changes." is a statement of fact. Incorrect use of "may".  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 change "may" to "can"  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 7 SC 7.3.2 P148 L52 # I-57  
 Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D MAY  
 "A discontinuity may occur in the value when the value of object rptrMonitorPortLastChange changes." is a statement of fact. Incorrect use of "may".  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 change "may" to "can"  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 7 SC 7.3.2 P149 L46 # I-58  
 Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D MAY  
 Both uses of "may" in this paragraph are incorrect: "ShortEvents may indicate externally generated noise hits that will cause the repeater to transmit Runt to its other ports, or propagate a collision (which may be late) back to the transmitting DTE and damaged frames to the rest of the network" stating a fact (possible consequence)  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 change "may" to "might"  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 7 SC 7.3.2 P149 L54 # I-59  
 Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D MAY  
 "Implementors may wish ..." is a clear indication of an informative statement. "may" is a normative word. The "not budgeted for in this standard" pretty clearly states this is not within the limits (scope) of this standard!  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 change to: It may be desirable to select the ShortEventMaxTime towards the lower end of the allowed tolerance range to accommodate bit losses suffered through physical channel devices not budgeted for within this standard.

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 7 SC 7.3.2 P150 L5 # I-60  
 Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D MAY  
 "A discontinuity may occur in the value when the value of object rptrMonitorPortLastChange changes." is a statement of fact. Incorrect use of "may".  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 change "may" to "can"  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 7 SC 7.3.2 P150 L42 # I-61  
 Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D MAY  
 "A CarrierEvent greater than or equal to 552 bit times but less than 565 bit times may or may not be counted as a runt." We have misuse of "may" and a "may not" (never correct). I \*think\* the may is correct (as in defining a behavior within the scope of the standard, based on the "shall" in the prior sentence).  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 delete "or may not"  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Received Comments

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

CI 7 SC 7.3.2 P150 L53 # I-62  
 Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D MAY  
 "In certain situations associated with large diameter networks a percentage of collision fragments may exceed ValidPacketMinTime." is an informative statement, or an technically incomplete specification. If the latter this draft is not ready for SA ballot. So I'm guessing the prior...  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 change "may" to "can"  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 7 SC 7.3.2 P150 L58 # I-63  
 Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D MAY  
 "A discontinuity may occur in the value when the value of object rptrMonitorPortLastChange changes." is a statement of fact. Incorrect use of "may".  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 change "may" to "can"  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 7 SC 7.3.2 P153 L17 # I-72  
 Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D MAY  
 "When this event occurs, other counters whose also be incremented, at the implementor's discretion."  
 This sounds like it might, possibly, be hiding an actual (optional) requirement! Hinted by "at the implementor's discretion". But we can't know because this isn't a correct statement of such. Which other counters may (optionally) be incremented? The following sentence suggests this is an informative statement - that something might occur that is outside the scope of this standard. If this is meant to convey an optional implementation within the scope of the standard, it should be so indicated in the description of those counters - and referenced here. If this is stating a possible consequence of implementation choices not specified in the scope of this standard, then "might" is the correct word. In any event, "may or may not" is always wrong.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Replace "may or may not" with "might".  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 7 SC 7.3.2 P153 L17 # I-64  
 Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D MAY  
 "When this event occurs, other counters whose also be incremented, at the implementor's discretion."  
 This sounds like it might, possibly, be hiding an actual (optional) requirement! Hinted by "at the implementor's discretion". But we can't know because this isn't a correct statement of such. Which other counters may (optionally) be incremented? The following sentence suggests this is an informative statement - that something might occur that is outside the scope of this standard. If this is meant to convey an optional implementation within the scope of the standard, it should be so indicated in the description of those counters - and referenced here. If this is stating a possible consequence of implementation choices not specified in the scope of this standard, then "might" is the correct word. In any event, "may or may not" is always wrong.

SuggestedRemedy  
 Replace "may or may not" with "might".  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 11 SC 11.2.1.4 P318 L8 # I-99  
 Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D MAY  
 "which may take tens of seconds for EFMCu ports, especially if PAF is involved" is the "PAF involved" supposed to be a condition on the permitted action? I think instead "may" is misused to state a possibility.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 change "may" to "can".  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.



Received Comments

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

Cl 11 SC 11.2.1.4 P318 L17 # I-98  
 Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D MAY  
 "some interfaces may fail to initialize" failing seems an unlikely option to permit within the scope of the standard. But a likely statement of factual consequence and "note that" suggests an informative statement.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change "some interfaces may fail to initialize while others succeed" to "some interfaces will fail to initialize while others succeed"  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Changed "some interfaces may fail to initialize" to "some interfaces can fail to initialize"

Cl 11 SC 11.2.3 P320 L43 # I-97  
 Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D MAY  
 " may become burdensome" suggests that burdensome is something specified in this standard as a permissible action. Seems like something to be avoided, not permitted.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change "may become" to "becomes"  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 11 SC 11.4 P322 L6 # I-95  
 Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D MAY  
 "may be affected" is a statement of fact, not a permissible action within the scope of this standard.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 change "may" to "might"  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 11 SC 11.4 P322 L10 # I-91  
 Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D MAY  
 "may" is being used incorrectly to describe a possible consequence, not a permissible action."may lead to"  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 change "may" to "might"  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 11 SC 11.4 P322 L13 # I-92  
 Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D MAY  
 "may" is being used incorrectly to describe a possible consequence, not a permissible action."may lead to"  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 change "may" to "might"  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 11 SC 11.4 P322 L15 # I-93  
 Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D MAY  
 "may" is being used incorrectly to describe a possible consequence, not a permissible action."may lead to may lead to a wrongful discover" mean that wrongful discovery is a permitted action within the scope of this standard. Quite strongly suspect this is not what is intended  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 change "may" to "might"  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Received Comments

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

Cl 11 SC 11.4 P322 L20 # I-94  
 Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D MAY  
 "may head to anything" is clearly an informative lead-in and not a permissible action within the scope of this standard.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 change "may" to "might"  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 11 SC 11.4 P322 L27 # I-96  
 Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D MAY  
 "may cause" is a statement of fact.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 change "may" to "might"  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 11 SC 11.5.2 P350 L26 # I-89  
 Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D MAY  
 This is stating a fact, not a permissible action within the scope of this standard.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change to "This value possibly indicates a problem with the peer PME"  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Changed "This value may indicate a possible" to "This value indicates a possible"

Cl 11 SC 11.5.2 P356 L49 # I-88  
 Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D MAY  
 "Profiles may be created/deleted using the row creation/ deletion mechanism via efmCuPme10PProfileRowStatus." Seems informative in context.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change "may be" to "are".  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 11 SC 11.5.2 P361 L31 # I-87  
 Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D MAY  
 "Entries may be created/deleted using the row creation/deletion mechanism via efmCuPme2ReachRateRowStatus." might not be wrong but it seems like an informative statement intended to direct the reader to where details of row creation/deletion are defined.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change to:  
 Entries are created/deleted using the row creation/deletion mechanism via efmCuPme2ReachRateRowStatus.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 11 SC 11.5.2 P363 L51 # I-86  
 Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D MAY  
 "Entries may be created/deleted using the row creation/deletion mechanism via efmCuPme2ReachRateRowStatus." might not be wrong but it seems like an informative statement intended to direct the reader to where details of row creation/deletion are defined.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change to:  
 Entries are created/deleted using the row creation/deletion mechanism via efmCuPme2ReachRateRowStatus.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Received Comments

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

Cl 11 SC 11.5.2 P366 L30 # I-85  
 Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D MAY  
 "Profiles may be created/deleted using the row creation/ deletion mechanism via efmCuPme10PProfileRowStatus." Are there other means by which these profiles are created and deleted? Is it permissible to use some other means? Specification is incomplete. Suspecting this is an informative statement introducing the normative requirement that follows.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change "may be" to "are".  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 11 SC 11.5.2 P367 L8 # I-84  
 Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D MAY  
 "may include" is a suspicious use of "may". Seems more informative. Seems permissible, and possible from the definition, that this string can contain a lot of information in addition to data rate and spectral limitations. Are those other things defined here permissible also? Perhaps the intention was merely use these two bits of information as an example of what the string can contain?  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change to:  
 The string includes information of this particular profile, for example, data rate and spectral limitations.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 11 SC 11.5.2 P372 L54 # I-83  
 Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D MAY  
 "or a micro-interruption may temporarily drop one or more PMEs in the aggregation group, causing a rate degradation of the aggregated EFMCu link." is stating a possible occurrence that is not defined in this standard.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change to:  
 or a micro-interruption that temporarily drops one or more PMEs in the aggregation group, causing a rate degradation of the aggregated EFMCu link.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 12 SC 12.1.3 P379 L10 # I-81  
 Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D MAY  
 Not cuser if this is stating an optional 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 (permissible/optional) means of resetting the device can be used to re-initialize the WIS. It (clearly) is unclear as written.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change to:  
 The MAU-MIB module provides the means to put a device in standby mode, or to reset the device. Reset can be used to re-initialize the WIS.

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 12 SC 12.3.2 P393 L59 # I-80  
 Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D MAY  
 Another misuse of "may" in an informative statement - explaining why the object is writeable.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 change "may" to "can".  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 13 SC 13.2 P401 L24 # I-79  
 Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates  
 Comment 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 kind of 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.

Received Comments

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

**Cl 13**    **SC 13.2.3**    **P402**    **L55**    # **[-65]**  
 Rolfe, Benjamin    Blind Creek Associates  
**Comment Type**    **T**    **Comment Status**    **D**    **MAY**  
 "may or may not" is never correct.  
**SuggestedRemedy**  
 change to "may"  
**Proposed Response**    **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Cl 13**    **SC 13.2.5.1**    **P405**    **L22**    # **[-78]**  
 Rolfe, Benjamin    Blind Creek Associates  
**Comment Type**    **TR**    **Comment Status**    **D**    **MAY**  
 Every use of "may" in this paragraph is wrong. This is clearly informative. It is describing possible FUTURE activities of a standards dvelopment group. This includes stating facts, consequeinces and possibilities clearly outsdie the scope of this standard. Seems like this was cut and pasted from an IETF document (in which context lower case "may" has different, non-normative meaning). Other IETF langauge is not appropriate to this standard "e.g. what does "standards-track" mean in IEEE-SA? We need not leave this question in the minds of the reader.

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Change to:  
 In some cases, new MAU types wil require additional managed objects, or have side effects on the behavior of existing managed objects. In such cases, specification in a standard is required, either in a new standard or a revision of this standard. Such specification is required to note any special properties of the MAU types that it defines—for example, side effects on the ifStackTable as noted in this standard for 10GBASE-W MAUs.

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

Changed

In some cases, new MAU types may require additional managed objects or may have side effects on the behavior of existing managed objects. In such cases, a standards-track specification (which may be a new document or a revision of this document) is also required. Any such document is required to note any special properties of the MAU types that it defines—for example, side effects on the ifStackTable as noted in this document for 10GBASE-W MAUs.

To

In some cases, new MAU types require additional managed objects, or have side effects on the behavior of existing managed objects. In such cases, specification in a standard is required, either in a new standard or a revision of this standard. Such specification is required to note any special properties of the MAU types that it defines—for example, side effects on the ifStackTable as noted in this standard for 10GBASE-W MAUs.

Received Comments

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

CI 13 SC 13.3 P406 L6 # I-77  
 Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D MAY  
 " may be used by other MIB module" seems an (incorrectly worded) statement of fact. I think it is used by other MIB modules. Some but not all.  
*SuggestedRemedy*  
 Change to: . The IANA-MAU-MIB module defines a set of textual conventions that are used by the MAU-MIB module and by other MIB modules to define management objects.  
*Proposed Response* Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 13 SC 13.3 P406 L29 # I-76  
 Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D MAY  
 I do not think that word means what you think it means. Actually, I am sure that within the context of an IEEE standard, "may be undesirable" is not what you mean. This says that it is permissible, within the scope of this standard, to be undesirable. This is an informative warning, stating a fact. The "In some environments" qualifies this as "not always" which is what I think you mean by "may be" in this instance.  
*SuggestedRemedy*  
 Change "may be" to "is".  
*Proposed Response* Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 13 SC 13.5.2 P406 L64 # I-75  
 Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D MAY  
 The use of "may" in a footnote is incorrect. "may" is normative. In particular defining an action within the limits (scope) of this standard. Users of this standard are not within the scope of this standard. What we mean with this is to grant permission. Which can be stated more clearly without abusing "may". Also fix this on page 91.  
*SuggestedRemedy*  
 Change to: Users of this standard are granted permission to freely reproduce the MIB module contained in this subclause so that it can be used for its intended purpose. Also change footnote on page 389 And again on page 322

*Proposed Response* Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 The text of the footnote is informative (Style Manual, 2020, section 18.2) and not 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.  
 No changes were made.

CI 13 SC 13.5.2 P414 L5 # I-74  
 Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D MAY  
 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 permissible action within the scope of this standard, which is using only a subset of the enumerated values. I could be wrong in which case the best course is delete the sentence.  
*SuggestedRemedy*  
 Change to "Agents may support a subset of the enumerated values"  
*Proposed Response* Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Received Comments

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

Cl 13 SC 13.5.2 P419 L54 # I-73  
 Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D MAY  
 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 permissible action within the scope if this standard, which is using only a subset of the enumerated values. I could be wrong in which case the best course is delete the sentence.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change to "Agents may support a subset of the enumerated values"  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 13 SC 13.5.2 P423 L13 # I-71  
 Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D MAY  
 "It may be necessary to provide for underlying hardware implementations which do not follow the exact behavior specified above" is an informative statement, perhaps a statement of fact or possibility. The purpose of this statement is unclear. But "may" as defined in the IEEE SA Standards Board Operations Manual 6.4.7 is not the correct word here. The following paragraph states a requirement. Is this informative statement meant to explain why the normative requirement exists? It seems unneeded to correctly implement the requirement that follows.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Delete the sentence.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 13 SC 13.5.2 P423 L53 # I-70  
 Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates  
 Comment 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 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.

Cl 13 SC 13.5.2 P423 L53 # I-69  
 Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates  
 Comment 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 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.

Cl 13 SC 13.5.2 P437 L32 # I-67  
 Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates  
 Comment Type TR 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 entities, 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.

Cl 13 SC 13.5.2 P437 L38 # I-68

Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates

Comment Type TR Comment Status D MAY

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*

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.

Cl 13 SC 13.5.2 P438 L28 # I-66

Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates

Comment Type TR 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 ACCEPT.