

Approved Responses

IEEE P802.3.1 (IEEE 802.3.1b) unsatisfied comments

Cl 0 SC 0 P L # I-90

Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates

Comment Type TR Comment Status A 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.

Response Response Status W

ACCEPT.

Cl 0 SC 0 P0 L0 # I-27

Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates

Comment Type TR Comment Status A

Reviewing the document for use of normative language, I find that "may" is used more often than not incorrectly, to state a possibility rather than a permissible action within the scope of the standard (see clause 1 and 6.4.7 of the IEEE SA Standards Board Operations Manual. In most places "may" is used to describe a consequence, statement of fact or otherwise in an informative, rather than normative, way. I found several instances 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 optional requirements, it will be harder than necessary to find and then verify the correct implementation of these behaviors. Which makes it more likely these will not be done correctly.

SuggestedRemedy

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.

Response Response Status W

ACCEPT.

Cl 1 SC 1 P17 L1 # I-26

Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates

Comment Type GR Comment Status A EZ

The editor's note should have been removed prior to balloting this draft. The scope clause has been updated to align with the PAR in this draft.

SuggestedRemedy

Please remove obsolete note prior to recirculation ballots to avoid confusion.

Response Response Status W

ACCEPT.

Cl 3 SC 3 P22 L37 # I-28

Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates

Comment Type TR Comment Status A 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.

Response Response Status W

ACCEPT.

Approved Responses

IEEE P802.3.1 (IEEE 802.3.1b) unsatisfied comments

CI 5 SC 5.4 P30 L64 # I-29

Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates

Comment Type TR Comment Status R 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

Response Response Status W

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 6 SC 6.2.2 P86 L63 # I-30

Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates

Comment Type TR Comment Status A 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

Response Response Status W

ACCEPT.

CI 6 SC 6.6.2 P97 L53 # I-33

Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates

Comment Type TR Comment Status A 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".

Response Response Status W

ACCEPT.

CI 6 SC 6.6.2 P98 L1 # I-34

Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates

Comment Type TR Comment Status A 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

Response Response Status W

ACCEPT.

CI 6 SC 6.6.2 P107 L50 # I-35

Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates

Comment Type TR Comment Status A 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".

Response Response Status W

ACCEPT.

Approved Responses

IEEE P802.3.1 (IEEE 802.3.1b) unsatisfied comments

Cl 6 SC 6.6.2 P108 L15 # I-36
 Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates
 Comment Type TR Comment Status A 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".
 Response Response Status W
 ACCEPT.

Cl 6 SC 6.6.2 P108 L45 # I-37
 Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates
 Comment Type TR Comment Status A 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".
 Response Response Status W
 ACCEPT.

Cl 6 SC 6.6.2 P109 L8 # I-38
 Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates
 Comment Type TR Comment Status A 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".
 Response Response Status W
 ACCEPT.

Cl 6 SC 6.6.2 P112 L34 # I-39
 Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates
 Comment Type TR Comment Status A 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".
 Response Response Status W
 ACCEPT.

Cl 6 SC 6.6.2 P112 L37 # I-40
 Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates
 Comment Type TR Comment Status A 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"
 Response Response Status W
 ACCEPT.

Cl 6 SC 6.6.2 P120 L49 # I-41
 Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates
 Comment Type TR Comment Status A 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 OAMPPDUs 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 OAMPPDUs is defined in this standard or in a normative reference.
 Response Response Status W
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Replace text "which may result in locally generated OAMPDUs" with "potentially resulting in locally generated OAMPDUs".

Cl 6 SC 6.6.2 P121 L6 # I-42
 Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates
 Comment Type TR Comment Status A 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".
 Response Response Status W
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Change "may" to "can"

Cl 6 SC 6.6.2 P122 L6 # I-43
 Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates
 Comment Type TR Comment Status A 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"
 Response Response Status W
 ACCEPT.

Approved Responses

IEEE P802.3.1 (IEEE 802.3.1b) unsatisfied comments

Cl 6 SC 6.6.2 P125 L17 # I-44

Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates

Comment Type TR Comment Status A 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.

Response Response Status W

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."

Cl 6 SC 6.6.2 P125 L45 # I-45

Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates

Comment Type TR Comment Status A 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.

Response Response Status W

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."

Cl 7 SC 7.1.1 P131 L23 # I-46

Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates

Comment Type TR Comment Status A 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"

Response Response Status W

ACCEPT.

Cl 7 SC 7.1.3.2 P132 L25 # I-47

Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates

Comment Type TR Comment Status A 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

Response Response Status W

ACCEPT.

Approved Responses

IEEE P802.3.1 (IEEE 802.3.1b) unsatisfied comments

Cl 7 SC 7.3.2 P139 L11 # I-48
 Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates
 Comment Type TR Comment Status A 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"
 Response Response Status W
 ACCEPT.

Cl 7 SC 7.3.2 P140 L1 # I-49
 Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates
 Comment Type TR Comment Status A 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"
 Response Response Status W
 ACCEPT.

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

Cl 7 SC 7.3.2 P142 L30 # I-51
 Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates
 Comment Type TR Comment Status A 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.
 Response Response Status W
 ACCEPT.

Cl 7 SC 7.3.2 P144 L34 # I-52
 Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates
 Comment Type TR Comment Status A 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.
 Response Response Status W
 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."

Approved Responses

IEEE P802.3.1 (IEEE 802.3.1b) unsatisfied comments

CI 7 SC 7.3.2 P144 L50 # I-53
 Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates
 Comment Type TR Comment Status A 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
 Response Response Status W
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Changed "Packets received during the test may or may not be transferred." to "Packets received during the test can be transferred."

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

CI 7 SC 7.3.2 P147 L43 # I-55
 Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates
 Comment Type TR Comment Status A 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"
 Response Response Status W
 ACCEPT.

CI 7 SC 7.3.2 P148 L20 # I-56
 Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates
 Comment Type TR Comment Status A 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"
 Response Response Status W
 ACCEPT.

CI 7 SC 7.3.2 P148 L52 # I-57
 Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates
 Comment Type TR Comment Status A 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"
 Response Response Status W
 ACCEPT.

CI 7 SC 7.3.2 P149 L46 # I-58
 Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates
 Comment Type TR Comment Status A MAY
 Both uses of "may" in this paragraph are incorrect: "ShortEvents may indicate externally generated noise hits that will cause the repeater to transmit Runts 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"
 Response Response Status W
 ACCEPT.

Approved Responses

IEEE P802.3.1 (IEEE 802.3.1b) unsatisfied comments

CI 7 SC 7.3.2 P149 L54 # I-59
 Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates
 Comment Type TR Comment Status A 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.
 Response Response Status W
 ACCEPT.

CI 7 SC 7.3.2 P150 L5 # I-60
 Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates
 Comment Type TR Comment Status A 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"
 Response Response Status W
 ACCEPT.

CI 7 SC 7.3.2 P150 L42 # I-61
 Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates
 Comment Type TR Comment Status A 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"
 Response Response Status W
 ACCEPT.

CI 7 SC 7.3.2 P150 L53 # I-62
 Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates
 Comment Type TR Comment Status A MAY
 "In certain situations associated with large diameter networks a percentage of collision fragments may exceed ValidPacketMinTime." is an informative statement, or a 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"
 Response Response Status W
 ACCEPT.

CI 7 SC 7.3.2 P150 L58 # I-63
 Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates
 Comment Type TR Comment Status A 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"
 Response Response Status W
 ACCEPT.

CI 7 SC 7.3.2 P153 L17 # I-72
 Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates
 Comment Type TR Comment Status A 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".
 Response Response Status W
 ACCEPT.

Approved Responses

IEEE P802.3.1 (IEEE 802.3.1b) unsatisfied comments

Cl 7 SC 7.3.2 P153 L17 # I-64

Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates

Comment Type TR Comment Status A 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".

Response Response Status W

ACCEPT.

Cl 11 SC 11.2.1.4 P318 L8 # I-99

Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates

Comment Type TR Comment Status A 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".

Response Response Status W

ACCEPT.

Cl 11 SC 11.2.1.4 P318 L17 # I-98

Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates

Comment Type TR Comment Status A 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"

Response Response Status W

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 A 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"

Response Response Status W

ACCEPT.

Cl 11 SC 11.4 P322 L6 # I-95

Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates

Comment Type TR Comment Status A MAY

"may be affected" is a statement of fact, not a permissible action within the scope of this standard.

SuggestedRemedy

change "may" to "might"

Response Response Status W

ACCEPT.

Approved Responses

IEEE P802.3.1 (IEEE 802.3.1b) unsatisfied comments

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

CI 11 SC 11.4 P322 L20 # I-94
 Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates
 Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **A** 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"
 Response Response Status **W**
 ACCEPT.

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

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

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

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

Approved Responses

IEEE P802.3.1 (IEEE 802.3.1b) unsatisfied comments

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

Cl 11 SC 11.5.2 P361 L31 # I-87
 Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates
 Comment Type TR Comment Status A 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.
 Response Response Status W
 ACCEPT.

Cl 11 SC 11.5.2 P363 L51 # I-86
 Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates
 Comment Type TR Comment Status A 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.
 Response Response Status W
 ACCEPT.

Cl 11 SC 11.5.2 P366 L30 # I-85
 Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates
 Comment Type TR Comment Status A 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".
 Response Response Status W
 ACCEPT.

Cl 11 SC 11.5.2 P367 L8 # I-84
 Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates
 Comment Type TR Comment Status A 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 nearlyuse these two bits of information as an exmple of what the string can contain?
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change to:
 The string includes information of this particular profile, for example, data rate and spectral lmitations.
 Response Response Status W
 ACCEPT.

Cl 11 SC 11.5.2 P372 L54 # I-83
 Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates
 Comment Type TR Comment Status A MAY
 "or a micro-interruption may temporarily drop one or more PME's 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 PME's in the aggregation group, causing a rate degradation of the aggregated EFMCu link.
 Response Response Status W
 ACCEPT.

Approved Responses

IEEE P802.3.1 (IEEE 802.3.1b) unsatisfied comments

Cl 12 SC 12.1 P378 L 22 # I-82

Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates

Comment Type TR Comment Status A

This seems to be stating a possible use of objects defined in this clause: "The objects defined in this clause may be used to manage an Ethernet interface employing any type of 10GBASE-W PHY". Taken with the next senetence, this seems important information.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to:
The objects in this clause are used to manage interfaces inplemented using 10GBASE-W PHYs.

Response Response Status W

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Changed to:
The objects in this clause are used to manage interfaces implemented using 10GBASE-W PHYs.

Cl 12 SC 12.1.3 P379 L 10 # I-81

Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates

Comment Type TR Comment Status A MAY

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

SuggestedRemedy

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

Response Response Status W

ACCEPT.

Cl 12 SC 12.3.2 P393 L 59 # I-80

Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates

Comment Type TR Comment Status A MAY

Another misuse of "may" in an informative statement - explaining why the object is writeable.

SuggestedRemedy

change "may" to "can".

Response Response Status W

ACCEPT.

Cl 13 SC 13.2 P401 L 24 # I-79

Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates

Comment Type TR Comment Status A MAY

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

SuggestedRemedy

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

Response Response Status W

ACCEPT.

Approved Responses

IEEE P802.3.1 (IEEE 802.3.1b) unsatisfied comments

Cl 13 SC 13.2.5.1 P405 L22 # I-78

Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates

Comment Type TR Comment Status A 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 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 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.

Response Response Status W

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.

Cl 13 SC 13.3 P406 L6 # I-77

Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates

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.

Response Response Status W

ACCEPT.

Cl 13 SC 13.3 P406 L29 # I-76

Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates

Comment 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" qualiffies 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.

Approved Responses

IEEE P802.3.1 (IEEE 802.3.1b) unsatisfied comments

Cl 13 SC 13.5.2 P 406 L 64 # I-75

Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates

Comment Type TR Comment Status R 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. Also change footnote on page 389 And again on page 322

Response Response Status W

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 13 SC 13.5.2 P 414 L 5 # I-74

Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates

Comment Type TR Comment Status A 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 asubset of the enumerated values. I could be wrong in which case the best coures is delete the sentence.

SuggestedRemedy

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

Response Response Status W

ACCEPT.

Cl 13 SC 13.5.2 P 419 L 54 # I-73

Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates

Comment Type TR Comment Status A 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 asubset of the enumerated values. I could be wrong in which case the best coures is delete the sentence.

SuggestedRemedy

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

Response Response Status W

ACCEPT.

Cl 13 SC 13.5.2 P 423 L 13 # I-71

Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates

Comment Type TR Comment Status A 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.

Response Response Status W

ACCEPT.

Cl 13 SC 13.5.2 P 423 L 53 # I-70

Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates

Comment Type TR Comment Status A 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."

Response Response Status W

ACCEPT.

Approved Responses

IEEE P802.3.1 (IEEE 802.3.1b) unsatisfied comments

Cl 13 SC 13.5.2 P423 L53 # I-69
 Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates
 Comment Type TR Comment Status A MAY
 More normative language in an informative statement. "Note that this MAU may be capable of operating as a MAU type that is beyond the scope of this MIB."
 SuggestedRemedy
 Delete the sentence. Change next sentence to: To indicate that this MAU is capable capable of operating as a MAU type that is beyond the scope of this MIB, return the bit value bOther in addition to the bit values set for standards capabilities that are listed in the IANAifMauAutoNegCapBits TC."
 Response Response Status W
 ACCEPT.

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

Cl 13 SC 13.5.2 P437 L38 # I-68
 Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates
 Comment Type TR Comment Status A 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."
 Response Response Status W
 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 A 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."
 Response Response Status W
 ACCEPT.