## ec-24-0281-02-00EC

### Approved Responses

#### IEEE P802.3.1 (IEEE 802.3.1b) unsatisfied comments

CI 0	SC 0	Р	L	# 1-90	C/ 1	SC 1		P <b>17</b>	L1	# I-26
Rolfe, B	enjamin	Blind Creek	Associates		Rolfe, Be	njamin		Blind Creek A	ssociates	
Commer	nt Type TR	Comment Status A		MAY	Commen	t Type GI	र	Comment Status A		EZ
may		from an operationally "up" EF s rate degradation." "mau caus	1 00 0					have been removed prior to n with the PAR in this draft.	•	draft. The scope clause
		use of may.			Suggeste	edRemedy				
00	edRemedy				Pleas	se remove ob	osolete i	note prior to recirculation ba	allots to avoid o	confusion.
Ren		from an operationally "up" EFN legradation on the port.	//Cu port, aggreg	ating several PMEs,	Response ACCI			Response Status W		
Respons	se	Response Status W			CI 3	SC 3		P 22	L37	# I-28
ACC	EPT.				Rolfe, Be	enjamin		Blind Creek A	ssociates	
CI 0	SC O	P <b>0</b>	LO	# 1-27	Commen	•	ł	Comment Status A		MAY
Rolfe, B	enjamin	Blind Creek	Associates					ain requirements (IEEE SA		
Commer Revi ofter scop	<i>Int Type</i> <b>TR</b> Tewing the docur In than not incorr the of the standar	Comment Status A ment for use of normative lang ectly, to state a possibility rath rd (see clause 1 and 6.4.7 of t	uage, I find that er than a permis he IEEE SA Star	sible action within the ndards Board	and s using "obvio	o does not b the term (m ous" categor	elong ir odule) i y so dor	e a course of action permis n clause 3. Also, using "in n it's own definition, which n't need it as part of the def of a module not part of defi	a modular syste is also not good finition. ", it typi	em" is very close to d. This is squarely in the
•		In most places "may" is used in an informative, rather than n		•	Suggeste	dRemedy				

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.

Response Response Status W

ACCEPT.

SuggestedRemedy

correctly.

Review each use of "may" in the document and repair the incorrect uses, keeping in mind that "within the limits of this standard" (that is, within the scope of what this standard). In each that is stating a consequence of an action, or a statement of fact or possibility, replace "may" with a word not defined by IEEE SA as normative. Ensure the remaining "mays" describe an observable, verifiable action or behavior. As the question "can I test this?" and if not, it is not a proper nominative statement.

of "may or may not", a clear indication of improper use of normative language. I caught quite a few, but likely missed many. I did find correct use of "may", describing permissible

(optional) actions defined within this standard. If anyone ever decides to implement the

implementation of these behaviors. Which makes it more likely these will not be done

optional requirements, it will be harder than necessary to find and then verify the correct

Response

Response Status W

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

CI 4 SC 4 Page 1 of 15 11/12/2024 12:03:38 PM

# IEEE P802.3.1 (IEEE 802.3.1b) unsatisfied comments

	SC 5.4	P 30	L 64	# I-29	CI 6	SC	6.6.2	P 9'	7 L	53	# I-33	
Rolfe, Be	njamin	Blind Creek A	ssociates		Rolfe, Be	njamin		Blind	Creek Associa	ites		
Comment	t Type TR	Comment Status R		MAY	Comment	Туре	TR	Comment Status	Α			MAY
actior scope	n within the limits e of this standar	a footnote is incorrect. "may" is s (scope) of this standard. Use d. What we mean with this is t vithout abusing "may". Also fix	ers of this standa to grant permiss	ard are not within the ion. Which can be	doesi Suggeste	n't define dReme	e an actio <i>dy</i>	ink" sounds a lot like n within the scope of on that link" to "are a	this standard.		nd this sentence	e
Suggeste	edRemedy						be used					
modu	ule contained in t	this standard are granted perm this subclause so that it can be ge on page 91 footnote. Make	e used for its inte	nded purpose.	Response ACCE			Response Status	W			
footn			·	, C	CI 6	SC	6.6.2	P 9	3 L	1	<b>#</b> I-34	
		nge on Page 449 footnote			Rolfe, Be	njamin		Blind	Creek Associa	ites		
Response REJE		Response Status W			Comment	Туре	TR	Comment Status	Α			MAY
of this and 8 No ch	s footnote has b 302.3.2, with req hanges were ma		releases of IEEE	Std 802.3, 802.3.1,	Suggeste Chan	dRemed ge to: N e or adr		the object ifOperStat	Ū	ner than up	(1) as a result o	f link
CI 6	SC 6.2.2	P 86	L 63	<b>#</b> I-30	ACCE	PT.						
	niomin											
Rolfe, Be	,	Blind Creek A	Associates		C/ 6	SC	6.6.2	P1	<b>)7</b> L	50	# 1-35	
Comment	t Type TR	Comment Status A		MAY	C/ <b>6</b> Rolfe, Be		6.6.2	-	<b>07</b> <i>L</i> Creek Associa	•••	# I-35	
Comment This i	<i>t Type</i> <b>TR</b> is an interestingl	Comment Status <b>A</b> ly incorrect use of "may". " This	is clause does no	ot include		njamin	6.6.2 TR	-	Creek Associa	•••	# <mark>I-35</mark>	МАҮ
Comment This i mech the st	<i>t Type</i> <b>TR</b> is an interestingl nanisms for cont tatus or statistics	Comment Status A	is clause does no oint may use this te explicitly statin	ot include functionality to query ig that the functionality	Rolfe, Be Comment "giver	njamin <i>Type</i> n the po	<b>TR</b> ssibility th	Blind	Creek Associa A st in transit." - (	ates use of "the		
Comment This i mech the st is not	<i>t Type</i> <b>TR</b> is an interestingl nanisms for cont tatus or statistics	Comment Status A ly incorrect use of "may". " This rolling how one Ethernet endpo s of a peer Ethernet entity" quit	is clause does no oint may use this te explicitly statin	ot include functionality to query ig that the functionality	Rolfe, Be Comment "giver	njamin <i>Type</i> n the po nis is sta	TR ssibility th ating a po	Blind <i>Comment Status</i> nat a frame may be lo	Creek Associa A st in transit." - (	ates use of "the		
Comment This i mech the st is not Suggeste Chan	t Type <b>TR</b> is an interestingle nanisms for cont tatus or statistics t defined in this of edRemedy nge to: This clar	Comment Status A ly incorrect use of "may". " This rolling how one Ethernet endpo s of a peer Ethernet entity" quit clause. So clearly stating "may use does not include	is clause does no oint may use this te explicitly statin y" is the wrong w	ot include functionality to query g that the functionality ord.	Rolfe, Be Comment "given hint tl Suggeste	njamin <i>Type</i> n the po nis is sta dRemed	TR ssibility th ating a po	Blind Comment Status nat a frame may be lo ssibility, not an optior	Creek Associa A st in transit." - (	ates use of "the		
Comment This i mech the st is not Suggeste Chan mech	t Type <b>TR</b> is an interestingle nanisms for cont tatus or statistics t defined in this of edRemedy nge to: This clan nanisms for cont	Comment Status <b>A</b> ly incorrect use of "may". " This rolling how one Ethernet endpo s of a peer Ethernet entity" quit clause. So clearly stating "may	is clause does no oint may use this te explicitly statin y" is the wrong w	ot include functionality to query g that the functionality ord.	Rolfe, Be Comment "given hint th Suggeste Chan Response	njamin <i>Type</i> n the po nis is sta dRemed ge "may	<b>TR</b> ssibility th ating a po	Blind Comment Status nat a frame may be lo ssibility, not an optior	Creek Associa A st in transit." - u nal requirement	ates use of "the		
Comment This i mech the st is not Suggeste Chan mech	<i>t Type</i> <b>TR</b> is an interestingle nanisms for cont tatus or statistics t defined in this of edRemedy nge to: This clan nanisms for cont s or statistics of	Comment Status A ly incorrect use of "may". " This rolling how one Ethernet endpo s of a peer Ethernet entity" quit clause. So clearly stating "may use does not include trolling how one Ethernet endpo	is clause does no oint may use this te explicitly statin y" is the wrong w	ot include functionality to query g that the functionality ord.	Rolfe, Be Comment "given hint tl Suggeste Chan	njamin <i>Type</i> n the po nis is sta dRemed ge "may	<b>TR</b> ssibility th ating a po	Blind Comment Status nat a frame may be lo ssibility, not an optior nt".	Creek Associa A st in transit." - u nal requirement	ates use of "the		

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** 

# IEEE P802.3.1 (IEEE 802.3.1b) unsatisfied comments

Delfe Deniensia	P 108	L15	# I-36	C/ 6	SC 6.	6.2	P <b>112</b>	L 34	# I-39	
Rolfe, Benjamin	Blind Creek As	ssociates		Rolfe, Be	njamin		Blind Creek A	ssociates		
Comment Type TR	Comment Status A		MAY	Comment	Туре	TR	Comment Status A			MAY
hint this is stating a	r that a frame may be lost in tran possibility, not an optional requir		e possibility" is a strong	drop	ped due to	transmi	here frames are it resource contention. " is sta lefined in this standard.	ating a possibili	ty, not a permissit	ole
SuggestedRemedy				Suggeste	<i>,</i> .	onione o				
Change "may" to "m	ight".				ge "may" t	o "miahi	Fu.			
Response	Response Status W					o mign				
ACCEPT.				Response ACCE			Response Status W			
C/ 6 SC 6.6.2	P108	L 45	# 1-37	ACCE	_F1.					
Rolfe, Benjamin	Blind Creek As	ssociates		C/ 6	SC 6.	6.2	P <b>112</b>	L 37	# I-40	
Comment Type TR	Comment Status A		MAY	Rolfe, Be	njamin		Blind Creek A	ssociates		
	that a frame may be lost in tran	sit." - use of "th	e possibility" is a strong	Comment	Туре	TR	Comment Status A			MA
hint this is stating a	possibility, not an optional require	ement.		Here	it is less th	nan clea	r if we're saying it is permissi	ble (within the s	cope of this stand	dard)
uggestedRemedy							s is suggesting a possibility c			
	1 - I- (II					e "note	that" (suggesting this is infor	mative, not norr	mative). So going	) with
Change "may" to "m	ight".			inform	native.					
Response	Response Status W			Suggeste	dRemedy					
ACCEPT.				chang	ge "may' to	"might"	1			
C/ 6 SC 6.6.2	P109	L <b>8</b>	# I-38	Response	9		Response Status W			
Rolfe, Benjamin	Blind Creek As	ssociates		ACCE	EPT.					
Comment Type TR	Comment Status A		MAY	C/ 6	SC 6.	6.2	P120	L 49	# I-41	
	that a frame may be lost in tran		e possibility" is a strong	Rolfe, Be	njamin		Blind Creek A	ssociates		
hint this is stating a	possibility, not an optional requir	ement.		Comment	Type	TR	Comment Status A			MAY
SuggestedRemedy				"whic	h may resi	ult in loc	ally generated			
Change "may" to "m	ight".						permissible action within the	scope of this sta	andard. Where is	that
Response	Response Status W						oss reference where local ge			
ACCEPT.							ch, this looks more like an inc			I
ACCEPT.				possi	ble outcom	ne, not a	permissible action within the	e limits (scope)	of this standard.	
				Suggeste	dRemedy					
				e bbe	roforonco	to wher				
					ative refere		e local generation of OAMPF	PDUs is defined	in this standard	or in a
					ative refere		Response Status W	PDUs is defined	in this standard	or in a
				norma Response	ative refere	ence.	Response Status W	PDUs is defined	in this standard	or in (

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

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general	CI 6	Page 3 of 15
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn	SC 6.6.2	11/12/2024 12:03:38 PM
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line		

# IEEE P802.3.1 (IEEE 802.3.1b) unsatisfied comments

CI 6	SC 6.6.2	P121	L <b>6</b>	# I-42
Rolfe, Be	enjamin	Blind Creek	Associates	
Commen	t Type TR	Comment Status A		MAY
or pro is sta	ocedure defined?	ility, or an optional requireme Use of technically incomple not a requirement, though it ote guess.	te term "other inf	ormation" suggests this
Suggeste	edRemedy			
chan	ge "may" to "can'	or "often will".		
Response	е	Response Status W		
ACC	EPT IN PRINCIP	LE.		
	nge "may" to "can	" P <b>122</b>	<i>L</i> 6	# <b>I-43</b>
CI 6			20	# 1-43
Cl 6	SC 6.6.2	Blind Crook	Accesictes	
Rolfe, Be	enjamin	Blind Creek	Associates	
Rolfe, Be Comment	enjamin <i>t Type</i> <b>TR</b>	Comment Status A		МАУ
Rolfe, Be Comment As th this s to sta	enjamin <i>t Type</i> <b>TR</b> iis is defining an o standard), where i		ible action within in this standard?	the limits (scope) of Perhaps the intent is
Rolfe, Be Comment As th this s to sta Then Suggeste	enjamin <i>t Type</i> <b>TR</b> is is defining an o standard), where i ate the possibility	Comment Status A optional requirement (permiss s "other information" defined of an action that might happe	ible action within in this standard?	the limits (scope) of Perhaps the intent is

C/ 6 SC **6.6.2** 

### IEEE P802.3.1 (IEEE 802.3.1b) unsatisfied comments

C/ 6	SC 6.6.2	P 125	L17	# I-44	CI <b>7</b>
Rolfe, B	Benjamin	Blind Creek	Associates		Rolfe, E
Comme	nt Type TR	Comment Status A		MAY	′ Comme
be	y" suggests this is	ences may he threshold," is a misuse of stating a possibility. It is no			"Th dev stai and
Suggest	tedRemedy				but
		For threshold crossing even of events and the number o			nee tecl
	e different.	or events and the number of		Notifications are intery	Sugges
Respon	se	Response Status W			cha
ACC	CEPT IN PRINCIP	LE.			Respon
<u>Cha</u>	and all instances	of "For threshold crossing e			AC
Cna			vents, since mult	inie occurrences mav	
				ipie occurrences may	
be r diffe	required to cross the erent." to "For three	e threshold, these values ar shold crossing events when	e likely multiple occurren	ices cross the	CI 7 Rolfe F
be r diffe thre	required to cross the erent." to "For three shold, the number	e threshold, these values ar	e likely multiple occurren	ices cross the	Rolfe, E
be r diffe thre to be	required to cross the erent." to "For three shold, the number e different."	e threshold, these values ar shold crossing events when of events and the number o	e likely multiple occurren f resulting Event I	nces cross the Notifications are likely	Rolfe, E Comme
be r diffe thre to b C/ 6	required to cross the erent." to "For three ishold, the number e different." SC 6.6.2	the threshold, these values ar shold crossing events when of events and the number o P125	e likely multiple occurren f resulting Event I L 45	ices cross the	Rolfe, E Comme Use enti
be r diffe thre to b C/ 6 Rolfe, B	required to cross the erent." to "For three shold, the number e different." SC 6.6.2 Benjamin	e threshold, these values ar shold crossing events when of events and the number o <i>P</i> 125 Blind Creek	e likely multiple occurren f resulting Event I L 45	the scross the Notifications are likely	Rolfe, E Comme Use enti pac
be r diffe thre to b C/ 6 Rolfe, B Comme	required to cross the erent." to "For three eshold, the number e different." SC 6.6.2 Benjamin <i>nt Type</i> <b>TR</b>	e threshold, these values ar shold crossing events when of events and the number o P125 Blind Creek Comment Status A	e likely multiple occurren f resulting Event I L 45	nces cross the Notifications are likely	Rolfe, E Comme Use ent pac
be r diffe thre to b C/ 6 Rolfe, B Commen "sine	required to cross the erent." to "For three ishold, the number e different." SC 6.6.2 Benjamin <i>nt Type</i> <b>TR</b> ce multiple occurre	e threshold, these values ar shold crossing events when of events and the number o P125 Blind Creek Comment Status A ences may	e likely multiple occurren f resulting Event I <i>L</i> 45 Associates	MAY	Rolfe, E Comme Use ent pac ma ma
be r diffe thre to be C/ 6 Rolfe, B Commen "sine be	equired to cross the erent." to "For three eshold, the number e different." SC 6.6.2 Benjamin <i>nt Type</i> <b>TR</b> ce multiple occurre required to cross t	e threshold, these values ar shold crossing events when of events and the number o P125 Blind Creek Comment Status A	e likely multiple occurren f resulting Event I <i>L</i> 45 Associates	MAY	Rolfe, E Comme Use ent pac ma ma Sugges
be r diffe thre to b C/ 6 Rolfe, B Commen "sin be Suggest	required to cross the erent." to "For three ishold, the number e different." SC 6.6.2 Benjamin <i>nt Type</i> <b>TR</b> ce multiple occurre required to cross to tedRemedy	e threshold, these values ar shold crossing events when of events and the number o P125 Blind Creek <i>Comment Status</i> <b>A</b> ences may he threshold," is stating a po	e likely multiple occurren f resulting Event I <i>L</i> 45 Associates ssibility, and so is	makes cross the Notifications are likely # <u>I-45</u> <i>MAY</i> s misuse of "may".	Rolfe, E Comme Use ent pac ma ma Sugges Cha rep
be r diffe thre to b C/ 6 Rolfe, B Comme "sind be Suggest Cha	required to cross the erent." to "For three ishold, the number e different." SC 6.6.2 Benjamin <i>nt Type</i> <b>TR</b> ce multiple occurre required to cross to tedRemedy ange "may" to "can	e threshold, these values ar shold crossing events when of events and the number o <i>P</i> 125 Blind Creek <i>Comment Status</i> <b>A</b> ences may he threshold," is stating a po ". Clarify to which values "th	e likely multiple occurren f resulting Event I <i>L</i> 45 Associates ssibility, and so is	makes cross the Notifications are likely # <u>I-45</u> <i>MAY</i> s misuse of "may".	Rolfe, F Comme ent pac ma ma Sugges Cha rep pac
be r diffe thre to b C/ 6 Rolfe, B Commen be Suggest Cha Respon	required to cross the erent." to "For three eshold, the number e different." SC 6.6.2 Benjamin <i>nt Type</i> <b>TR</b> ce multiple occurre required to cross to tedRemedy ange "may" to "can se	e threshold, these values ar shold crossing events when of events and the number o <b>P125</b> Blind Creek <i>Comment Status</i> <b>A</b> ences may he threshold," is stating a po ". Clarify to which values "th <i>Response Status</i> <b>W</b>	e likely multiple occurren f resulting Event I <i>L</i> 45 Associates ssibility, and so is	makes cross the Notifications are likely # <u>I-45</u> <i>MAY</i> s misuse of "may".	Rolfe, E Comme Use enti pac
be r diffe thre to b C/ 6 Rolfe, B Commen be Suggest Cha Respon	required to cross the erent." to "For three ishold, the number e different." SC 6.6.2 Benjamin <i>nt Type</i> <b>TR</b> ce multiple occurre required to cross to tedRemedy ange "may" to "can	e threshold, these values ar shold crossing events when of events and the number o <b>P125</b> Blind Creek <i>Comment Status</i> <b>A</b> ences may he threshold," is stating a po ". Clarify to which values "th <i>Response Status</i> <b>W</b>	e likely multiple occurren f resulting Event I <i>L</i> 45 Associates ssibility, and so is	makes cross the Notifications are likely # <u>I-45</u> <i>MAY</i> s misuse of "may".	Rolfe, F Comme ent pac ma ma Sugges Cha rep pac ma

C/ 7	SC 7.1.1	P131	L 23	# I-46
Rolfe, B	enjamin	Blind Creek As	sociates	
Commer	nt Type TR	Comment Status A		MAY

se repeater MIB module objects may be used to manage non-standard repeater-like ces; however, defining objects to describe implementation-specific properties of nondard repeater-like devices is outside the scope of this standard." - the "non standard" "outside the scope of this standard" strongly indicate this is not a correct use of "may" ather a warning of what can or might happen. If you want to stick with "may" you'd to provide a normative reference to the non-standard uses that are permissible to be nically complete :-)

#### edRemedy

ge "may" to "might"

Respons ACC	e EPT.	Response Status W		
CI 7	SC 7.1.3.2	P <b>132</b>	L 25	# 1-47
Rolfe, B	enjamin	Blind Creek A	ssociates	
Commer	nt Type TR	Comment Status A		MAY

of normative language in an informative note: "NOTE-When a network management y is observing a repeater, it may appear as though the repeater is passing ets to a higher level protocol entity. However, this is only a means of implementing agement, and this passing of agement information is not part of the repeater functionality."

#### edRemedy

nge to (not be wrong): NOTE—When a network management entity is observing a ater, and observes the repeater passing

ets to a higher level protocol entity, this is only a means of implementing agement, and this passing of management information is not part of the repeater tionality

Response Status W

e

FPT.

CI 7 SC 7.1.3.2

# IEEE P802.3.1 (IEEE 802.3.1b) unsatisfied comments

CI 7 SC 7.3	.2 P139	L11	# I-48	CI 7 S	C 7.3.2	P142	L 30	# I-51
Rolfe, Benjamin	Blind Creek	Associates		Rolfe, Benjami	n	Blind Creek A	Associates	
" This value may enterprises subt paragraph sugge standard) functio	R Comment Status A be allocated within the SMI tree (1.3.6.1.4.1) " might not be con ests this is informative, suggesting on might use this object. If this is n there to find the defined behavior.	how an external	(not defined in this	may or ma informative SuggestedRen	may or ma ay not", an not norma nedy		parenthetical - a	Il clues this is
SuggestedRemedy change "may" to Response	"might" <i>Response Status</i> <b>W</b>			Response ACCEPT.	Note that	for some port types it is not port types it is not port types and the second second second second second second		· ·
ACCEPT.				CI <b>7</b> S	C 7.3.2	P144	L34	# I-52
CI 7 SC 7.3	.2 P140	L <b>1</b>	# I-49	Rolfe, Benjami Comment Type		Blind Creek A Comment Status A	Associates	MAY
"Some ports may	R Comment Status A   y not be present in the repeater systion, not an action within the scope   "might"   Response Status W			standard, s Perhaps or entire para <i>SuggestedRen</i> change to:	o we can't n the imple graph seer <i>nedy</i> For examp	nitted." well the implementer is prescribe requirements, even mentation. I don't thin this is w ns to be informative Thus my ole, it is possible, and may be o e transmitted.	optional ones, o what the group n guess:	on the implementer. neans because the
ACCEPT.				Response		Response Status W		
CI 7 SC 7.3	.2 P141	L13	# I-50	ACCEPT I		PLE.		
Rolfe, Benjamin Comment Type T Misuse of "may".	Blind Creek / R Comment Status A	Associates	MAY	allow the S	NMP resp	le, the implementor may choos onse to be transmitted." to "Fo MP response to be transmitted	r example, it is p	
SuggestedRemedy change to " This	identifies the port independently f	rom the repeater	to which it is attached					
Response ACCEPT.	Response Status W	·						

C/ 7 SC **7.3.2**  Page 6 of 15 11/12/2024 12:03:38 PM

# IEEE P802.3.1 (IEEE 802.3.1b) unsatisfied comments

CI 7	SC 7.3.2	P144	L <b>50</b>	# I-53	CI 7	SC 7.	3.2	P 148	L <b>20</b>	# I-56
Rolfe, Be	enjamin	Blind Creek A	ssociates		Rolfe, Be	enjamin		Blind Creek A	ssociates	
Commen	t Type TR	Comment Status A		MAY	Commen	t Type	TR	Comment Status A		MAY
"may	eived during the te /". Since none of	est may or may not be transfe f the other listed items appears is shouldn't either.			rptrM Suggeste	onitorPort	LastCha	ccur in the value when the va ange changes." is a statemen		rect use of "may".
Suggeste	edRemedy					ge "may" t	o "can"			
chan	ge to: Packets r	eceived during the test can be	but are not req	uired to be transferred	Response			Response Status W		
Respons	е	Response Status W			ACCI	EPT.				
ACC	EPT IN PRINCIP	LE.			CI 7	SC 7.	3.2	P 148	L 52	# I-57
Char	nged "Packets rec	ceived during the test may or n	nav not be trans	sferred." to "Packets	Rolfe, Be	enjamin		Blind Creek A	ssociates	
		st can be transferred."			Commen	t Type	TR	Comment Status A		MAY
CI <b>7</b>	SC 7.3.2	P147	L13	# 1-54				cur in the value when the va		rect use of "may".
Rolfe, Be	enjamin	Blind Creek A	ssociates		Suggeste	dRemedy				·
Commen	t Type TR	Comment Status A		MAY	00	ge "may" t				
	scontinuity may c n the value of obj	occur in the value ect_rptrMonitorPortLastChang	e changes" is s	tating a possibility.	Response			Response Status W		
Suggeste	edRemedy				ACCI	EPI.				
chan	ge "may" to "can'	1			C/ 7	SC 7.	3.2	P149	L 46	<b>#</b> I-58
Respons	e	Response Status W			Rolfe, Be	enjamin		Blind Creek A	ssociates	
ACC	EPT.				Commen	t Type	TR	Comment Status A		MAY
CI 7	SC 7.3.2	P147	L <b>43</b>	# I-55	gene	erated nois	e hits th	his paragraph are incorrect: " hat will cause the repeater	ShortEvents m	ay indicate externally
Rolfe, Be	enjamin	Blind Creek A	ssociates					other ports, or propagate		
Commen	51	Comment Status A		MAY				be late) back to the transmit ating a fact (possible consequence)		lamaged frames to the
rptrN		fact: "A discontinuity may occup hange changes." Stating a po-			Suggeste	edRemedy ge "may" t			,	
	edRemedy				Response	0 ,	5	Response Status W		
00	ige "may" to "can'	1			ACCI					
Respons	e	Response Status W								

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/ 7 SC **7.3.2**  Page 7 of 15 11/12/2024 12:03:38 PM

# IEEE P802.3.1 (IEEE 802.3.1b) unsatisfied comments

-												
C/ 7 SC 7.3.2	P 149	L <b>54</b>	# I-59		CI <b>7</b>	SC 7	.3.2		P 150	L <b>53</b>	# I-62	
Rolfe, Benjamin	Blind Creek As	ssociates			Rolfe, Ber	njamin			Blind Creek A	Associates		
Comment Type TR	Comment Status A			MAY	Comment	Туре	TR	Comment	Status A			MAY
normative word. The	wish" is a clear indication of a e "not budgeted for in this standa ope) of this standard!			a	fragme techni	ents may	v exceed	ValidPacket	/linTime." is an	informative sta	ercentage of collis atement, or an ady for SA ballot. S	
,	be desirable to select the ShortEv	ventMaxTime to	wards the lower er	nd of	Suggested	dRemedy	,					
the allowed tolerand	ce range to accommodate bit los				•	ge "may" i	to "can"	_				
Response	Response Status W				Response			Response S	Status W			
ACCEPT.					ACCE	PT.						
	D450	1.5	# 1.00		CI 7	SC 7	.3.2		P150	L 58	# <mark>I-63</mark>	
	P150	L <b>5</b>	<b>#</b> I-60		Rolfe, Ber	njamin			Blind Creek A	Associates		
Rolfe, Benjamin	Blind Creek As	ssociates			Comment	Туре	TR	Comment	Status A			MAY
Comment Type TR	Comment Status A			MAY					e when the va			
	y occur in the value when the val Change changes." is a statement		actuse of "may"		rptrMc	onitorPort	tLastCha	nge changes.	" is a statemer	nt of fact. Incor	rect use of "may".	
	Change changes. Is a statement		ectuse of may.		Suggested	dRemedu	/					
Suggested Demodul					ouggesiet	antoniouy						
,						ge "may"						
change "may" to "ca						ge "may" i		Response S	Status <b>W</b>			
change "may" to "ca Response	an" Response Status W				chang	ge "may" i e		Response S	Status W			
change "may" to "ca					chang Response ACCE	ge "may" f e EPT.	to "can"	Response S		/ 17	# 170	
change "may" to "ca Response ACCEPT.		L 42	# [-61		chang Response ACCE Cl <b>7</b>	ge "may" S PT. SC <b>7</b>	to "can"	Response S	P153	L17	# <u>I-72</u>	
change "may" to "ca Response ACCEPT. Cl 7 SC 7.3.2	Response Status W		# <mark>[-61</mark>		chang Response ACCE Cl 7 Rolfe, Ber	ge "may" PT. SC <b>7</b> njamin	.3.2		P 153 Blind Creek A		# [1-72	
Response ACCEPT.	Response Status W		# [ <u>-61</u>		chang Response ACCE Cl 7 Rolfe, Ber Comment	ge "may" PT. SC <b>7</b> njamin <i>Type</i>	to "can" .3.2 TR	Comment	P <b>153</b> Blind Creek A Status <b>A</b>	Associates		
change "may" to "ca Response ACCEPT. Cl 7 SC 7.3.2 Rolfe, Benjamin Comment Type TR "A CarrierEvent great may not be counted correct). I *think* th standard, based on	Response Status W P150 Blind Creek As	s but less than t f "may" and a "r a behavior within	565 bit times may o nay not" (never	MAY	chang Response ACCE Cl 7 Rolfe, Ber Comment "Wher discre This s the im such.	ge "may" EPT. SC 7 njamin <i>Type</i> n this eve tion." sounds lik plemento Which o	.3.2 TR ent occur te it migh pr's discr ther cou	Comment s s, other count t, possibly, be etion". But we nters may (op	P 153 Blind Creek A Status A ers whose als e hiding an actu e can't know be tionally) be inc	Associates o be increment ual (optional) re ecause this isn' remented? The	ed, at the impleme quirement! Hinted t a correct stateme e following sentence	entor's by "at ent of ce
change "may" to "ca Response ACCEPT. Cl 7 SC 7.3.2 Rolfe, Benjamin Comment Type TR "A CarrierEvent grea may not be counted correct). I *think* th standard, based on	Response Status W P150 Blind Creek As Comment Status A ater than or equal to 552 bit times as a runt." We have misuse of he may is correct (as in defining a	s but less than t f "may" and a "r a behavior within	565 bit times may o nay not" (never	MAY	chang Response ACCE Cl 7 Rolfe, Ber Comment "Wher discre This s the im such. sugge scope	ge "may" PT. SC 7 njamin <i>Type</i> n this ever etion." ounds lik nplemento Which o ests this is e of this st	.3.2 TR ent occur te it migh or's discr ther cou s an infoi tandard.	Comment s s, other count t, possibly, be etion". But we nters may (op mative staten If this is mea	P 153 Blind Creek A Status A ers whose als e hiding an actu e can't know be tionally) be inc nent - that som ant to convey a	Associates o be increment ual (optional) re ecause this isn' remented? The nething might of n optional imple	ed, at the impleme quirement! Hinted t a correct stateme	by "at by "at ent of ce the the
change "may" to "ca Response ACCEPT. Cl 7 SC 7.3.2 Rolfe, Benjamin Comment Type TR "A CarrierEvent great may not be counted correct). I *think* th standard, based on SuggestedRemedy delete "or may not"	Response Status W P150 Blind Creek As Comment Status A ater than or equal to 552 bit times as a runt." We have misuse of he may is correct (as in defining a	s but less than t f "may" and a "r a behavior within	565 bit times may o nay not" (never	MAY	chang Response ACCE Cl 7 Rolfe, Ber Comment "Wher discre This s the im such. sugge scope referei specifi	ge "may"   PT. SC 7 njamin <i>Type</i> n this even sounds like plemento Which o bests this is o of this si o of the st benced her	<b>.3.2</b> <b>TR</b> ent occur ther toccur ther cou s an info tandard, andard, e. If this a scope c	Comment 3 s, other count t, possibly, be etion". But we nters may (op mative staten lf this is mea t should be so is stating a po f this standard	P 153 Blind Creek A Status A ers whose als e hiding an actu e can't know be tionally) be inc tionally) be inc nent - that som ant to convey a p indicated in th possible conseq	Associates o be increment ual (optional) re ecause this isn' remented? The iething might of in optional imple he description of juence of imple	ed, at the impleme quirement! Hinted t a correct stateme e following senten ccur that is outside ementation within	by "at by "at ent of ce the the and not
change "may" to "ca Response ACCEPT. Cl 7 SC 7.3.2 Rolfe, Benjamin Comment Type TR "A CarrierEvent greating "A CarrierEvent greating" "A CarrierEvent greating "A CarrierEvent greating" "A CarrierEvent greati	Response Status W P150 Blind Creek As Comment Status A ater than or equal to 552 bit times as a runt." We have misuse of he may is correct (as in defining a the "shall" in the prior sentence).	s but less than t f "may" and a "r a behavior within	565 bit times may o nay not" (never	MAY pr	chang Response ACCE Cl 7 Rolfe, Ber Comment "Wher discre This s the im such. sugge scope referei specifi	ge "may" PT. SC 7 njamin <i>Type</i> n this ever etion." sounds lik plemento Which o ests this is of this st of the st inced her fied in the y not" is a	.3.2 TR ent occur ther to discr ther cou s an infor tandard, andard, e. If this s scope c always w	Comment 3 s, other count t, possibly, be etion". But we nters may (op mative staten lf this is mea t should be so is stating a po f this standard	P 153 Blind Creek A Status A ers whose als e hiding an actu e can't know be tionally) be inc tionally) be inc nent - that som ant to convey a p indicated in th possible conseq	Associates o be increment ual (optional) re ecause this isn' remented? The iething might of in optional imple he description of juence of imple	ed, at the implement quirement! Hinted t a correct statement of following sentence ccur that is outside ementation within of those counters - mentation choices	by "at ent of ce the and not
change "may" to "ca Response ACCEPT. Cl 7 SC 7.3.2 Rolfe, Benjamin Comment Type TR "A CarrierEvent greating may not be counted correct). I *think* th standard, based on SuggestedRemedy delete "or may not" Response	Response Status W P150 Blind Creek As Comment Status A ater than or equal to 552 bit times as a runt." We have misuse of he may is correct (as in defining a the "shall" in the prior sentence).	s but less than t f "may" and a "r a behavior within	565 bit times may o nay not" (never	MAY pr	chang Response ACCE Cl 7 Rolfe, Ber Comment "Wher discre This s the im such. sugge scope scope refere specifi or may Suggested	ge "may" PT. SC 7 njamin <i>Type</i> n this ever etion." ourds lik plementor Which o ests this is of the st inced her fied in the y not" is a dRemedy	.3.2 TR ent occur ther cour ther cour s an infor tandard, andard, andard, i fithis e scope c always w	Comment 3 s, other count t, possibly, be etion". But we nters may (op mative staten lf this is mea t should be so is stating a po f this standard	P 153 Blind Creek A Status A ers whose als a hiding an actu a can't know be tionally) be inc nent - that som ant to convey a b indicated in th possible conseq d, then "might"	Associates o be increment ual (optional) re ecause this isn' remented? The iething might of in optional imple he description of juence of imple	ed, at the implement quirement! Hinted t a correct statement of following sentence ccur that is outside ementation within of those counters - mentation choices	by "at by "at ent of ce the the and not
change "may" to "ca Response ACCEPT. Cl 7 SC 7.3.2 Rolfe, Benjamin Comment Type TR "A CarrierEvent greating of the counted correct). I *think* the standard, based on SuggestedRemedy delete "or may not" Response	Response Status W P150 Blind Creek As Comment Status A ater than or equal to 552 bit times as a runt." We have misuse of he may is correct (as in defining a the "shall" in the prior sentence).	s but less than t f "may" and a "r a behavior within	565 bit times may o nay not" (never	MAY pr	chang Response ACCE Cl 7 Rolfe, Ber Comment "Wher discre This s the im such. sugge scope scope refere specifi or may Suggested	ge "may" PT. SC 7 njamin <i>Type</i> n this even sounds like of this side of this side of the st nced her fied in the y not" is a dRemedy nce "may"	.3.2 TR ent occur ther cour ther cour s an infor tandard, andard, andard, i fithis e scope c always w	Comment s s, other count t, possibly, be etion". But we nters may (op mative staten If this is mea t should be so is stating a po f this standard rong.	P 153 Blind Creek A Status A ers whose als e hiding an acture e can't know be tionally) be inc inonally) be inc inonally) be inc inonally) be inc convey a p indicated in th possible conseq d, then "might"	Associates o be increment ual (optional) re ecause this isn' remented? The iething might of in optional imple he description of juence of imple	ed, at the implement quirement! Hinted t a correct statement of following sentence ccur that is outside ementation within of those counters - mentation choices	by "at by "at ent of ce the the and not

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 Page 8 of 15 SC 7.3.2 11/12/2024 12:03:38 PM SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

CI 7

### IEEE P802.3.1 (IEEE 802.3.1b) unsatisfied comments

Cl <b>7</b>	SC 7.3.2	P 153	L17	# I-64
Rolfe, Benj	jamin	Blind Creek As	sociates	
Comment T	Tvpe <b>TR</b>	Comment Status A		MAY

Comment Type **TR** Comment Status A

"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".

TR

Response	Response Status	W
ACCEPT.		

C/ 11	SC 11.2.1.4	P 318	

Rolfe, Benjamin Comment Type Blind Creek Associates

Comment Status A

MAY

# I-99

"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 possiblity.

L 8

#### SuggestedRemedy

change "may" to "can".

Response

ACCEPT.

Response Status W

C/ 11	SC 11.2.1.4	P 318	L17	# I-98
Rolfe, Be	enjamin	Blind Creek A	ssociates	
Commen	t Type TR	Comment Status A		MAY
			متعرب والأرمان ومعلاه	and a superior is sufficient to a

"some interfaces may fail to initialize" failing seems an unlikely optionto 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"

Response Response Status W

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Changed "some interfaces may fail to initialize" to "some interfaces can fail to initialize"

C/ 11	SC 11.2.3	P 320	L <b>43</b>	# I-97
Rolfe, Be	njamin	Blind Creek A	Associates	
Comment	t Type TR	Comment Status A		MAY
		some" suggests that burdens ible action. Seems like some		0
Suggeste	dRemedy			
Chan	ge "may become	" to "becomes"		
Response	9	Response Status W		
ACCE	EPT.			
C/ 11	SC 11.4	P 322	L <b>6</b>	# <u>I-95</u>
Rolfe, Be	njamin	Blind Creek A	Associates	
Comment	t Type TR	Comment Status A		MAY
"may stand		statement of fact, not a perm	issible action wit	hin the scope of this
Suggeste	dRemedy			
chang	ge "may" to "migł	nt"		
Response	e	Response Status W		
ACCE	EPT.			

# IEEE P802.3.1 (IEEE 802.3.1b) unsatisfied comments

C/ 11	SC 11.4	P 322	L 10	# <u>I</u> -91	C/ 11 SC 11.4	P 322	L 20	# <u>I-94</u>
Rolfe, Ber	njamin	Blind Creek A	ssociates		Rolfe, Benjamin	Blind Creek As	ssociates	
Comment	Type <b>TR</b>	Comment Status A		MAY	Comment Type TR	Comment Status A		MAY
	' is being used n."may lead to"	incorrectly to describe a possible	e consequence,	not a permissible	"may head to anythi the scope of this st	ing" is clearly an informative lead andard.	l-in and not a pe	rmissible action within
	<i>dRemedy</i> ge "may" to "mi	ght"			SuggestedRemedy change "may" to "m	ight"		
Response ACCE		Response Status W			Response ACCEPT.	Response Status W		
C/ 11	SC 11.4	P <b>322</b>	L13	# <mark>I-92</mark>	C/ 11 SC 11.4	P <b>322</b>	L 27	# I-96
Rolfe, Ber	njamin	Blind Creek A	ssociates		Rolfe, Benjamin	Blind Creek As	ssociates	
Comment	Type <b>TR</b>	Comment Status A		MA	Comment Type TR	Comment Status A		MAY
	' is being used n."may lead to"	incorrectly to describe a possible	e consequence,	not a permissible	"may cause" is a sta	atement of fact.		
Suggested					SuggestedRemedy change "may" to "m	ight"		
Response ACCE		gnt Response Status W			Response ACCEPT.	Response Status W		
						P 350	L26	# 1-89
C/ 11	SC 11.4	P322	/ 15	# 1-93	C/ 11 SC 11.5.2			# 1-69
	SC 11.4	P <b>322</b> Blind Creek A	L15	# <mark>1</mark> -93	Rolfe, Benjamin	Blind Creek As		
C/ 11 Rolfe, Ber	njamin	Blind Creek A			Rolfe, Benjamin Comment Type <b>TR</b>	Blind Creek As Comment Status A	ssociates	MAY
Rolfe, Ber Comment "may" action discov	njamin * <i>Type</i> <b>TR</b> ' is being used n."may lead to ve" measn that		Associates le consequence, ed action within t	MA), not a permissible	Rolfe, Benjamin Comment Type <b>TR</b> This is stating a fact SuggestedRemedy Change to "This val	Blind Creek As Comment Status <b>A</b> t, not a permisible action within th ue possibly indactes a pproblem	ssociates he scope of this	MAY standard.
Rolfe, Ber Comment "may" action discov	njamin <i>Type</i> <b>TR</b> ' is being used n."may lead to ve" measn that dard. Quite stro	Blind Creek A Comment Status A incorrectly to describe a possib may lead to a wrongful wrongful discovery is a permitte	Associates le consequence, ed action within t	MA), not a permissible	Rolfe, Benjamin <i>Comment Type</i> <b>TR</b> This is stating a fact <i>SuggestedRemedy</i>	Blind Creek A Comment Status A t, not a permisible action within th ue possibly indactes a pproblem Response Status W	ssociates he scope of this	MAY standard.
Rolfe, Ber Comment "may" action discov stanad Suggested	njamin <i>Type</i> <b>TR</b> ' is being used n."may lead to ve" measn that dard. Quite stro	Blind Creek A Comment Status A incorrectly to describe a possible may lead to a wrongful wrongful discovery is a permitte ongly suspect this is not what is	Associates le consequence, ed action within t	MA), not a permissible	Rolfe, Benjamin Comment Type <b>TR</b> This is stating a fact SuggestedRemedy Change to "This val Response ACCEPT IN PRINC	Blind Creek As Comment Status A t, not a permisible action within th ue possibly indactes a pproblem <i>Response Status</i> W IPLE.	ssociates he scope of this with the peer Pt	MA y standard. ME"
Rolfe, Ber Comment "may" action discov stanad	njamin <i>Type</i> <b>TR</b> ' is being used n."may lead to ve" measn that dard. Quite stro dRemedy ge "may" to "mi	Blind Creek A Comment Status A incorrectly to describe a possible may lead to a wrongful wrongful discovery is a permitte ongly suspect this is not what is	Associates le consequence, ed action within t	MA), not a permissible	Rolfe, Benjamin Comment Type <b>TR</b> This is stating a fact SuggestedRemedy Change to "This val Response ACCEPT IN PRINC	Blind Creek A Comment Status A t, not a permisible action within th ue possibly indactes a pproblem Response Status W	ssociates he scope of this with the peer Pt	MA y standard. ME"

C/ 11 SC 11.5.2

## IEEE P802.3.1 (IEEE 802.3.1b) unsatisfied comments

C/ 11	SC 11.5.2	P <b>356</b>	L <b>49</b>	# <mark>I-88</mark>		C/ 11	SC 11.5.2	
Rolfe, Ber	njamin	Blind Creek	Associates			Rolfe, Ber	njamin	
Comment	Type TR	Comment Status A			MAY	Comment	Type TR	Comment
		ed/deleted using the row creater RowStatus. "Seems information of the second		echanism via		efmCu	les may be creat uPme10PProfile	RowStatus. "
Suggested Chang	<i>dRemedy</i> ge "may be" to "a	are".				incom	ed and deleted? plete. Suspectin ement that follow	ig this is an inf
Response	9	Response Status W				Suggestee	dRemedy	
ACCE	PT.					Chang	ge "may be" to "a	are".
C/ 11	SC 11.5.2	P 361	L <b>31</b>	# 1-87		Response		Response
Rolfe, Ber	njamin	Blind Creek	Associates			ACCE	PT.	
Comment	Type TR	Comment Status A			MAY	C/ 11	SC 11.5.2	
		ed/deleted using the row crea				Rolfe, Ber	njamin	
		teRowStatus." might not be v direct the reader to where de				Comment	Type TR	Comment
Suggested							include" is a sus	
Chan	-						ossible from the a rate and spect	
Entrie	0	leted using the row creation/ teRowStatus.	deletion mechan	ism via		Perha	ps the intention	was mearlyus
Response	)	Response Status W				Suggestee	dRemedy	
ACCE	PT.					Chang	-	
C/ 11	SC 11.5.2	P 363	L <b>51</b>	# 1-86		The s Imitati	tring includes inf ions.	ormation of th
Rolfe, Ber	njamin	Blind Creek	Associates			Response	i	Response
Comment	Type TR	Comment Status A			MAY	ACCE	PT.	
"Entrie efmCu	es may be create uPme2ReachRat	ed/deleted using the row creater teRowStatus." might not be w	ation/deletion me vrona but it seen	chanism via ns like an informati	ve	C/ 11	SC 11.5.2	
		direct the reader to where de				Rolfe, Ber	njamin	
Suggested	dRemedy					Comment	Type TR	Comment
		leted using the row creation/ teRowStatus.	deletion mechan	ism via		causi	micro-interruption ing a rate degrace not defined in th	dation of the ag
Response	)	Response Status W				Suggestee	dRemedy	
ACCE	EPT.					Chang or a m	-	
						Response	1	Response
						ACCE	PT.	

	SC 11.5.2	P 366	L 30	# <u>I</u> -85
Rolfe, Be	njamin	Blind Cr	eek Associates	
Comment	51	Comment Status A	creation/ deleti	MA'
efmC create incom	uPme10PProfileF ed and deleted?	RowStatus. " Are there Is it permissible to use s this is an informative s	other means by some other mea	which these profiles are ns? Specification is
Suggeste	dRemedy			
Chan	ge "may be" to "a	re".		
Response	9	Response Status V	1	
ACCE	EPT.			
C/ 11	SC 11.5.2	P367	L8	<b>#</b> I-84
Rolfe, Be	njamin	Blind Cr	eek Associates	
•	_			
Comment	51	Comment Status A		MA
"may and p to dat Perha	include" is a sus ossible from the a rate and spectr	picious use of "may". S definition, that this string al limitations. Are those vas mearlyuse these tw	eems more info can contain a l other things de	MA' rmative. Seems permisible, ot of information in addition fined here permisible also? tion as an exmaple of what
"may and p to dat Perha	include" is a sus ossible from the a rate and spectr aps the intention v ring can contain?	picious use of "may". S definition, that this string al limitations. Are those vas mearlyuse these tw	eems more info can contain a l other things de	rmative. Seems permisible, ot of information in addition fined here permisible also?
"may and p to dat Perha the st Suggester Chan	include" is a sus ossible from the a rate and spectr aps the intention v ring can contain? <i>dRemedy</i> ge to: tring includes info	picious use of "may". S definition, that this string al limitations. Are those vas mearlyuse these tw	eems more info can contain a l other things de bits of informa	rmative. Seems permisible, ot of information in addition fined here permisible also?
"may and p to dat Perha the st Suggeste Chan The s	include" is a sus ossible from the a rate and spectr aps the intention v ring can contain? <i>dRemedy</i> ge to: tring includes info ions.	picious use of "may". S definition, that this string al limitations. Are those vas mearlyuse these tw	eems more info other things det o bits of informa or profile, for exa	rmative. Seems permisible, ot of information in addition fined here permisible also? tion as an exmaple of what
"may and p to dat Perha the st Suggester Chan The s Imitat	include" is a sus ossible from the a rate and spectra ps the intention v ring can contain? <i>dRemedy</i> ge to: tring includes info ions.	picious use of "may". S definition, that this string al limitations. Are those vas mearlyuse these tw prmation of this particula	eems more info other things det o bits of informa or profile, for exa	rmative. Seems permisible, ot of information in addition fined here permisible also? tion as an exmaple of what
"may and p to dat Perha the st <i>Suggester</i> Chan The s Imitat	include" is a sus ossible from the a rate and spectra ps the intention v ring can contain? <i>dRemedy</i> ge to: tring includes info ions.	picious use of "may". S definition, that this string al limitations. Are those vas mearlyuse these tw prmation of this particula	eems more info other things det o bits of informa or profile, for exa	rmative. Seems permisible, ot of information in addition fined here permisible also? tion as an exmaple of what

ype TR icro-interruption may temporarily drop one or more PMEs in the aggregation group, g a rate degradation of the aggregated EFMCu link." is stating a possible occurance

Comment Status A

Response Status W

#### Remedy

ro-interruption that temporarily drops one or more PMEs in the aggregation group, g a rate degradation of the aggregated EFMCu link.

MAY

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general C/ 11 Page 11 of 15 COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn SC 11.5.2 11/12/2024 12:03:38 PM

SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

# IEEE P802.3.1 (IEEE 802.3.1b) unsatisfied comments

					_		
C/ 12 SC 12.1 P3	78 L 22	# 1-82	C/ 12	SC 12.3.2	P <b>393</b>	L <b>59</b>	# I-80
Rolfe, Benjamin Blind	Creek Associates		Rolfe, Be	njamin	Blind Creek A	Associates	
Comment Type TR Comment Status	Α		Comment	Type TR	Comment Status A		MAY
This seems to be stating a possible use of o defined in this clause may be used to mana 10GBASE-W PHY". Taken with the next se	ge an Ethernet interface	employing any type of	Anoth writea Suggeste	able.	ay" in an informative statemer	nt - explaining wh	hy the object is
SuggestedRemedy			00	ge "may" to "can	".		
Change to: The objects in this clause are used to mana W PHYs.	ge interfaces inmplemen	ted using 10GBASE-	Response ACCE		Response Status W		
Response Response Status	w		C/ 13	SC 13.2	P 401	L <b>24</b>	# I-79
ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.			Rolfe, Be	niamin	Blind Creek A	Associates	
The objects in this clause are used to mana PHYs. Cl 12 SC 12.1.3 P3		# [-81	interfa kindo	aces." is an infor f just is Ethernet	e connected to IEEE 802.3 rep mative statement. BTW, wha , right?		
Rolfe, Benjamin Blind	Creek Associates		Suggeste	dRemedy			
Comment Type TR Comment Status		MAY	Chan MAUs		ted to IEEE 802.3 repeaters o	r IEEE 802.3 inte	erfaces.
Not cuser if this is stating an optinal action of a possible use of the MIB module. It reads r also provides the means to put a device in s used to re-initialize the WIS." which seems (permisible/optional) means of reseting the (clearly) is unclear as writen.	nore like the later. " The standby mode or to reset to be noting that the defi	MAU-MIB module it; the latter may be ned	Response ACCE		Response Status W		
SuggestedRemedy							
Change to: The MAU-MIB module provides the means device. Reset can be used to re-initialize the		mode, or to reset the					
Response Response Status	w						

ACCEPT.

Response Statu

C/ 13 SC 13.2

### IEEE P802.3.1 (IEEE 802.3.1b) unsatisfied comments

C/ 13	SC 13.2.5.1	P 405	L <b>22</b>	# I-78
Rolfe, Be	njamin	Blind Creek As	sociates	
Comment	Type TR	Comment Status A		MAY

Comment Type Comment Status A TR

Every use of "may" in this paragraph is wrong. This is clealry informative. It is describing possible FUTURE activities of a standards dvelopment group. This includes stating facts, consequeinces and possiblities 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 language 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.

Response Status W

Response

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.

#### То

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.

C/ 13 S	C 13.3	P 406	L <b>6</b>	# 1-77
Rolfe, Benjami	n	Blind Creek As	ssociates	
Comment Type	TR	Comment Status A		MAY

" may be used by other MIB module" seems an (incorrectl 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.

Respons ACC		Response Status W		
C/ 13	SC 13.3	P 406	L <b>29</b>	# I-76
Rolfe, Be	enjamin	Blind Creek A	ssociates	
Commen	t Type TR	Comment Status A		MAY

I do not thin that word means what you thin it means. Actually, I am sure that within the context of an IEEE standard, "may be undesireavle" is not what you mean. This says that it is permissible, within the scope of this standard, to be undesireable. This is an informative warning, stating a fact. The "In some environments" gualilities this as "not always" which is what I think you mean by "may be" in this instance.

#### SuggestedRemedy

Change "may be" to "is".

Response Response Status W

ACCEPT.

C/ 13 SC 13.3

# IEEE P802.3.1 (IEEE 802.3.1b) unsatisfied comments

C/ 13 S	SC 13.5.2	P 406	L 64	# <u>I-75</u>	C/ 13	SC 1	3.5.2	ŀ	₽419	L 54	# I-73	
Rolfe, Benjam	nin	Blind Creek As	sociates		Rolfe, E	enjamin		Bli	nd Creek As	ssociates		
Comment Typ	e TR	Comment Status R			MAY Comme	nt Type	TR	Comment Stat	us A			MAY
action with scope of t	hin the limits (s his standard.	otnote is incorrect. "may" is n scope) of this standard. Users What we mean with this is to out abusing "may". Also fix th	s of this standa grant permiss	ard are not within the sion. Which can be	e am stai	guessing th dard, whic	hat this is h is using	meant to define	a permisible the enumera	action within th	ndard. For this on ne scope if this could be worng in	
SuggestedRer	medy				Sugges	edRemedy	/					
module co Also chan		s standard are granted permis s subclause so that it can be u n page 389			Respon	0 0	jents may	support a subset Response Statu		merated valules	,"	
Response		Response Status W			C/ 13	SC 1	3.5.2	ŀ	<sup>-</sup> 423	L13	# I-71	
REJECT.						enjamin	0.0.2		nd Creek As	-	<i>"</i> 171	
The text o	of the footnote i	is informative (Style Manual, 2	2020 section 1	18 2) and not	Comme	,	TR	Comment Stat		550014105		MAY
of this foot	tnote has beer	n balloted before in various re	leases of IEEE	E Std 802.3, 802.3.1				provide for under				IOT
and 802.3 No change	tnote has beer 3.2, with reques es were made. SC <b>13.5.2</b>	st for changes.	Leases of IEEE		, follo stat defi to e	w the exac ement of fa ned in the I e. The foll xplain why	t behavionant act or poson IEEE SA owing pa the norm	or specified above sibility. The purpo Standards Board ragraph states a r ative requirement	e" is an info ose of this s Operations requirement	ormative statem tatement is und Manual 6.4.7 is . Is this inform		as vord neant
and 802.3 No change C/ <b>13</b>	8.2, with reques es were made. SC <b>13.5.2</b>	st for changes.	L 5	5 Std 802.3, 802.3.1 # [I-74	, folic stat defi her to e the	w the exact ement of fa- ned in the I e. The follow requirement	t behavion act or posized SA IEEE SA owing pa the norm that fol	or specified above sibility. The purpo Standards Board ragraph states a r ative requirement	e" is an info ose of this s Operations requirement	ormative statem tatement is und Manual 6.4.7 is . Is this inform	ent, perhaps a lear. But "may" a s not the correct w ative statement m	as vord neant
and 802.3 No change C/ <b>13</b> S Rolfe, Benjam	8.2, with reques es were made. SC <b>13.5.2</b> nin	st for changes. P <b>414</b>	L 5	# [ <u>1-74</u>	, folk stat defi her to e the Sugges	w the exact ement of fa ned in the I e. The follow plain why requirement edRemedy	et behavion act or pos IEEE SA owing pa the norm that fol	or specified above sibility. The purpo Standards Board ragraph states a r ative requirement	e" is an info ose of this s Operations requirement	ormative statem tatement is und Manual 6.4.7 is . Is this inform	ent, perhaps a lear. But "may" a s not the correct w ative statement m	as vord neant
and 802.3 No change Cl 13 S Rolfe, Benjam Comment Typ Use of "m. am guessi standard,	8.2, with request es were made. SC 13.5.2 hin be TR ay not". All use ing that this is which is using	st for changes. P414 Blind Creek As <i>Comment Status</i> A es of "may not" are incorrect i meant to define a permisible only asubset of the enumera	L 5 sociates n an IEEE star action within th	# [ <del>-74</del> ndard. For this one he scope if this	, folk stat defi her to e the <i>Sugges</i> <i>MAY</i> Del I <i>Respon</i>	w the exact ement of fa hed in the l s. The foll- kplain why requirement edRemedy ate the sen	et behavion act or pos IEEE SA owing pa the norm that fol	or specified above sibility. The purpo Standards Board ragraph states a r ative requirement	e <sup>i</sup> is an info ose of this s Operations requirement t exists? It s	ormative statem tatement is und Manual 6.4.7 is . Is this inform	ent, perhaps a lear. But "may" a s not the correct w ative statement m	as vord neant
and 802.3 No change Cl <b>13</b> Rolfe, Benjam Comment Typ Use of "m am guessi standard, case the b	8.2, with request es were made. SC 13.5.2 hin be TR ay not". All use ing that this is which is using poest coures is o	st for changes. P414 Blind Creek As <i>Comment Status</i> A es of "may not" are incorrect i meant to define a permisible	L 5 sociates n an IEEE star action within th	# [ <del>-74</del> ndard. For this one he scope if this	, folk stat defi her to e the <i>Sugges</i> <i>MAY</i> Del I <i>Respon</i>	w the exact ement of fa hed in the I e. The follow plain why requirement edRemedy the the sen se	et behavio act or pos IEEE SA owing pa the norm ht that fol / tence.	or specified above sibility. The purpo Standards Board ragraph states a r ative requirement ows. Response Statu	e <sup>i</sup> is an info ose of this s Operations requirement t exists? It s	ormative statem tatement is und Manual 6.4.7 is . Is this inform	ent, perhaps a lear. But "may" a s not the correct w ative statement m	as vord neant
and 802.3 No change Cl <b>13</b> Rolfe, Benjam Comment Typ Use of "m am guessi standard, case the b SuggestedRef	8.2, with request es were made. SC 13.5.2 hin be TR ay not". All use ing that this is which is using best coures is o medy	P 414 P 414 Blind Creek As Comment Status A es of "may not" are incorrect i meant to define a permisible only asubset of the enumera delete the sentence.	L 5 sociates n an IEEE star action within th ted values. I c	# <u>I-74</u> ndard. For this one he scope if this could be worng in wh	, folk stat defi her to e the Sugges MAY Del I Respon hich AC	w the exact ement of fa hed in the I e. The foll- kplain why requirement edRemedy ete the sen se CEPT.	et behavio act or pos IEEE SA owing pa the norm ht that fol / tence.	r specified above sibility. The purpo Standards Board ragraph states a n ative requirement lows. Response Statu	e" is an info ose of this s Operations requirement t exists? It s us W	L 53	ent, perhaps a lear. But "may" a s not the correct w ative statement m d to correctly imple	as vord neant
and 802.3 No change Cl 13 S Rolfe, Benjam Comment Typ Use of "m. am guessi standard, case the b SuggestedRer Change to	8.2, with request es were made. SC 13.5.2 hin be TR ay not". All use ing that this is which is using best coures is o medy	<i>P</i> 414 Blind Creek As <i>Comment Status</i> <b>A</b> es of "may not" are incorrect i meant to define a permisible only asubset of the enumera delete the sentence. support a subset of the enum	L 5 sociates n an IEEE star action within th ted values. I c	# <u>I-74</u> ndard. For this one he scope if this could be worng in wh	, folk stat defi her to e the Sugges MAY Del I Respon hich AC	w the exact ement of fa hed in the l . The follow kplain why requirement edRemedy ete the sen se CEPT. SC 1 enjamin	et behavio act or pos IEEE SA owing pa the norm ht that fol / tence.	r specified above sibility. The purpo Standards Board ragraph states a n ative requirement lows. Response Statu	e" is an info ose of this s Operations requirement t exists? It s us W P423 nd Creek As	L 53	ent, perhaps a lear. But "may" a s not the correct w ative statement m d to correctly imple	as vord eant ement
and 802.3 No change Cl 13 S Rolfe, Benjam Comment Typ Use of "m. am guessi standard, case the b SuggestedRer Change to	8.2, with request es were made. SC 13.5.2 hin be TR ay not". All use ing that this is which is using best coures is of medy o "Agents may	P 414 P 414 Blind Creek As Comment Status A es of "may not" are incorrect i meant to define a permisible only asubset of the enumera delete the sentence.	L 5 sociates n an IEEE star action within th ted values. I c	# <u>I-74</u> ndard. For this one he scope if this could be worng in wh	, follow stat define to e the Sugges MAY Del I Respondent for the C/ 13 Rolfe, E Comme More More More More More More More Mor	w the exact ement of fa hed in the l . The follow kplain why requirement edRemedy ete the sen se CEPT. SC 1 enjamin nt Type e normative	et behavio act or pos IEEE SA owing pa the norm that fol / tence. 3.5.2 TR e languag	or specified above sibility. The purpo Standards Board ragraph states a r ative requirement lows. Response Statu H Bli	e" is an info ose of this s Operations requirement t exists? It s us W P423 nd Creek As us A ve statemen	L 53 L 53 L 54 L 53 L 54 L 53	ent, perhaps a dear. But "may" a s not the correct w ative statement m d to correctly imple # [I-70	as vord eant ement
and 802.3 No change Cl 13 S Rolfe, Benjam Comment Typ Use of "m. am guessi standard, case the b SuggestedRer Change to Response	8.2, with request es were made. SC 13.5.2 hin be TR ay not". All use ing that this is which is using best coures is of medy o "Agents may	<i>P</i> 414 Blind Creek As <i>Comment Status</i> <b>A</b> es of "may not" are incorrect i meant to define a permisible only asubset of the enumera delete the sentence. support a subset of the enum	L 5 sociates n an IEEE star action within th ted values. I c	# <u>I-74</u> ndard. For this one he scope if this could be worng in wh	, folk stat defi her to e the <i>Sugges</i> <i>MAY</i> Del I <i>Respon</i> hich ACI <i>C/</i> 13 Rolfe, E <i>Comme</i> May	w the exact ement of fa hed in the l . The follow kplain why requirement edRemedy ete the sen se CEPT. SC 1 enjamin nt Type e normative	et behavid act or pos IEEE SA owing pa the norm ht that fol / tence. 3.5.2 TR e language erating as	or specified above sibility. The purpo Standards Board ragraph states a r ative requirement lows. Response Statu Bli Comment Statu ge in an informativ	e" is an info ose of this s Operations requirement t exists? It s us W P423 nd Creek As us A ve statemen	L 53 L 53 L 54 L 53 L 54 L 53	ent, perhaps a dear. But "may" a s not the correct w ative statement m d to correctly imple # [I-70	as vord neant ement
and 802.3 No change Cl 13 S Rolfe, Benjam Comment Typ Use of "m. am guessi standard, case the b SuggestedRer Change to Response	8.2, with request es were made. SC 13.5.2 hin be TR ay not". All use ing that this is which is using best coures is of medy o "Agents may	<i>P</i> 414 Blind Creek As <i>Comment Status</i> <b>A</b> es of "may not" are incorrect i meant to define a permisible only asubset of the enumera delete the sentence. support a subset of the enum	L 5 sociates n an IEEE star action within th ted values. I c	# I-74 ndard. For this one he scope if this could be worng in wh	, folk stat defi her to e the Sugges MAY Del I Respon hich ACI C/ 13 Rolfe, E Comme Mon cap Sugges Del ope in a	w the exact ement of fa hed in the I e. The follow plain why requirement edRemedy ete the sen SE EEPT. SC 1 enjamin <i>nt Type</i> e normative able of ope edRemedy ete the sen rating as a	t behavior act or pos IEEE SA owing pa the norm that fol / tence. 3.5.2 TR e language erating as / tence. Cl a MAU typ he bit val	or specified above sibility. The purpo Standards Board ragraph states a r ative requirement lows. <i>Response Statu</i> <i>Bli</i> <i>Comment Statu</i> ge in an informative a MAU type that hange next senter be that is beyond ues set for standa	e" is an info ose of this s Operations requirement t exists? It s us W P423 nd Creek As us A ve statement is beyond t nce to: To in the scope o	<i>L</i> <b>53</b> <i>L</i> <b>54</b> <i>L</i> <b>53</b> <i>L</i> <b>53</b> <i>L</i> <b>53</b> <i>L</i> <b>54</b> <i>L</i> <b>53</b> <i>L</i> <b>54</b> <i>L</i> <b>53</b> <i>L</i> <b>54</b> <i>L</i> <b>53</b> <i>L</i> <b>54</b> <i>L</i> <b>53</b> <i>L</i> <b>54</b> <i>L</i> <b>53</b> <i>L</i> <b>54</b> <i>L</i> <b>53</b> <i>L</i> <b>55</b> <i>L</i> <b>56</b> <i>L</i> <b>56</b> <i>L</i> <b>57</b> <i>L</i> <b>57</b> <i>L L</i> <b>57</b> <i>L L</i> <b>57</b> <i>L L</i> <b>57</b> <i>L L</i> <b>57</b> <i>L L L</i> <b>57</b> <i>L L L L L L L L L L</i>	ent, perhaps a dear. But "may" a s not the correct w ative statement m d to correctly imple # [-70 his MAU may be s MIB." MAU is capable irn the bit value b0	as vord neant ement <i>MAY</i> of
and 802.3 No change Cl 13 S Rolfe, Benjam Comment Typ Use of "m. am guessi standard, case the b SuggestedRer Change to Response	8.2, with request es were made. SC 13.5.2 hin be TR ay not". All use ing that this is which is using best coures is of medy o "Agents may	<i>P</i> 414 Blind Creek As <i>Comment Status</i> <b>A</b> es of "may not" are incorrect i meant to define a permisible only asubset of the enumera delete the sentence. support a subset of the enum	L 5 sociates n an IEEE star action within th ted values. I c	# I-74 ndard. For this one he scope if this could be worng in wh	, folk stat defi her to e the Sugges MAY Del I Respon hich ACI C/ 13 Rolfe, E Comme Mon cap Sugges Del ope in a	w the exact ement of fa hed in the I s. The follow plain why requirement edRemedy ete the sen se CEPT. SC 1 enjamin <i>nt Type</i> e normative able of ope edRemedy ete the sen rating as a ddition to the AifMauAutor	t behavior act or pos IEEE SA owing pa the norm that fol / tence. 3.5.2 TR e language erating as / tence. Cl a MAU typ he bit val	or specified above sibility. The purpo Standards Board ragraph states a r ative requirement lows. <i>Response Statu</i> <i>Bli</i> <i>Comment Statu</i> ge in an informative a MAU type that hange next senter be that is beyond ues set for standa	e" is an info operations requirement t exists? It s us W P423 nd Creek As us A ve statement is beyond t nee to: To in the scope o ards capabili	<i>L</i> <b>53</b> <i>L</i> <b>54</b> <i>L</i> <b>53</b> <i>L</i> <b>53</b> <i>L</i> <b>53</b> <i>L</i> <b>54</b> <i>L</i> <b>53</b> <i>L</i> <b>54</b> <i>L</i> <b>53</b> <i>L</i> <b>54</b> <i>L</i> <b>53</b> <i>L</i> <b>54</b> <i>L</i> <b>53</b> <i>L</i> <b>54</b> <i>L</i> <b>53</b> <i>L</i> <b>54</b> <i>L</i> <b>53</b> <i>L</i> <b>55</b> <i>L</i> <b>56</b> <i>L</i> <b>56</b> <i>L</i> <b>57</b> <i>L</i> <b>57</b> <i>L L</i> <b>57</b> <i>L L</i> <b>57</b> <i>L L</i> <b>57</b> <i>L L</i> <b>57</b> <i>L L L</i> <b>57</b> <i>L L L L L L L L L L</i>	ent, perhaps a dear. But "may" a s not the correct w ative statement m d to correctly imple # [-70 his MAU may be s MIB." MAU is capable irn the bit value b0	as vord neant ement <i>MAY</i> of

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 SC 13.5.2 11/12/2024 12:03:38 PM SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

C/ 13

Page 14 of 15

### IEEE P802.3.1 (IEEE 802.3.1b) unsatisfied comments

C/ 13	SC 1:	3.5.2	P 423	L 53	# <mark>I-6</mark> 9		C/ 13	SC 13.5.2	P 437
Rolfe, Be	njamin		Blind Creek As	ssociates			Rolfe, Be	njamin	Blind C
Commen	t Type	TR	Comment Status A			MAY	Comment	Type <b>TR</b>	Comment Status
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."							Use of normative language in an informative r MIB may have capabilities that extend beyond This is a statement of possibility, clearly asse		
Suggeste	dRemedy								ossibility, clearly asse the words "beyond the
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."							SuggestedRemedy change to "Note that it is possible that interfac that extend beyond the scope of this MIB."		
ACCI	EPT.						ACCE	EPT IN PRINCIPL	.E.
C/ 13	SC 1:	3.5.2	P 437	L 32	# I-67		Deleted the statement. Nothing in the standa covered by this MIB.		
Rolfe, Be	njamin		Blind Creek As	ssociates			cover	ed by this wib.	
Commen	t Type	TR	Comment Status R			MAY	C/ 13	SC 13.5.2	P 438
			rmative statement (NOTE that				Rolfe, Be	njamin	Blind C
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						Comment	Type <b>TR</b>	Comment Status	
the re	equired ac	tion stat	ed in the next sentence (I'm g g - which is why leaving the im	uessing), which	n is not all that cle	ear (I	some	thing outside the	rmative statement (NC scope of this MIB as it
Suggeste	dRemedy								ght be an actual require

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."

Response Response Status W 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.

C/ 13	SC 13.5.2	P 437	L 38	# I-68
Rolfe, Ber	njamin	Blind Creek As		
Comment	Type <b>TR</b>	Comment Status A		MAY

note: " Note that interfaces that support this nd the scope of this MIB" erted to be outside the scope fi this standard or the scope of this MIB".

aces supporting this MIB also have capabilities

ard prevents interfaces to have capabilities not

C/ 13	SC 13.5.2	P 438	L 28	# I-66
Rolfe, Be	njamin	Blind Creek As		
Comment	t Type TR	Comment Status A		MAY

OTE that). Which is clearly describing it says "outside the scope of this MIB" in the irement 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."

Response Response Status W

ACCEPT.

C/ 13 SC 13.5.2