

Proposed Responses

IEEE P802.3cf D0.1 YANG Data Model Definitions 1st Task Force review comments

Cl **FM** SC **FM** P1 L1 # 1 [REDACTED]
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communicatio
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **D**
 No line numbers in Front Matter
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add line numbers into Front Matter
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **FM** SC **FM** P5 L1 # 2 [REDACTED]
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communicatio
 Comment Type **T** Comment Status **D**
 Text under introduction box belongs to 802.3.1
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace three paragraphs with "TBD - to be added when the list of YANG modules is completed"
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **FM** SC **FM** P7 L10 # 3 [REDACTED]
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communicatio
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **D**
 Missing TF officers
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add TF Chair and Chief Editor information
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **FM** SC **FM** P9 L1 # 4 [REDACTED]
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communicatio
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **D**
 Acknowledgements were neded in 802.3.1, not likely in 802.3.2 and not for now.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Remove. Consider adding it back when and if needed to acknowlege any public review on GIT?
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **1** SC **1** P13 L39 # 5 [REDACTED]
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communicatio
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **D**
 Clause should start at the top of the page
 SuggestedRemedy
 Insert page break before heading level 1
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **1** SC **1.1** P13 L47 # 6 [REDACTED]
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communicatio
 Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **D**
 YANG data models or YANG data modules?
 SuggestedRemedy
 It seems like we have teminology issue: the majority of use cases seem to gravitate towards "YANG modules"
 Change all instances of "YANG data models" to "YANG modules"
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Terminology definitions from RFC 6929: "data model: A data model describes how data is represented and accessed" and "module: A YANG module defines a hierarchy of nodes that can be used for NETCONF-based operations. With its definitions and the definitions it imports or includes from elsewhere, a module is self-contained and "compilable"."

It seems "data model" is kind of requirements designs while "data module" is an implementation with detailed defined nodes. In this case, if we want to say entire 802.3 ethernet, we can use "YANG data model", while if we go to specify functions by defining nodes/features, which is implemtation of the model, it would better go for module.

Proposed Responses

IEEE P802.3cf D0.1 YANG Data Model Definitions 1st Task Force review comments

Cl 3 SC 3 P17 L1 # 7
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communicatio

Comment Type ER Comment Status D

Page numbers at the bottom of the page do not coincide with the page numbers displayed in PDF reader. For example, it is page 19 (as marked in pdf) but page 17 (as shown in PDF reader)

SuggestedRemedy
 Make sure pages are aligned

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 3 SC 3.1 P17 L8 # 8
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communicatio

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

There are a couple of terms which need to be defined and are missing now in [B6]: YANG module, YANG data node

SuggestedRemedy
 TF needs to provide these definitions and their references, I assume these would come from IETF RFCs ?

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Terminology definitions from RFC 6929:

"data model: A data model describes how data is represented and accessed"

"module: A YANG module defines a hierarchy of nodes that can be used for NETCONF-based operations. With its definitions and the definitions it imports or includes from elsewhere, a module is self-contained and "compilable"."

Cl 5 SC 5 P21 L4 # 10
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communicatio

Comment Type E Comment Status D

Hanging paragraph

SuggestedRemedy
 Create new subclause 5.1 Introduction and move line 4 in there

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 5 SC 5.1 P21 L8 # 9
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communicatio

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Title of subclause 5.1 says "Module structure"

SuggestedRemedy
 Change to "YANG module structure" for consistency. The same in 6.3
 Similaty, change "Module definition" to "YANG module definition". The same in 6.6

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 5 SC 5.2 P21 L18 # 11
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communicatio

Comment Type E Comment Status D

Missing comma between "802.3" and "clause"

SuggestedRemedy
 per comment

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 5 SC 5.2 P21 L22 # 12
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communicatio

Comment Type T Comment Status D

"attributes" or "managed objects"? We speak of "Clause 30 managed objects everywhere else

SuggestedRemedy
 Change "and the attributes" to "and managed objects"

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Proposed Responses

IEEE P802.3cf D0.1 YANG Data Model Definitions 1st Task Force review comments

Cl 5 SC 5.2 P21 L27 # 13
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communicatio

Comment Type E Comment Status D

The whole mapping between Clause 30 and YANG module nodes is hard to read and follow in this structure. I would suggest to use the structure of the YANG module similar to the one shown in 5.3.1, and add managed object / attribute(s) abd reference, if available. Apply the same logic to Table 5-1 and Table 5-2, as well as Table 6-1 in Clause 6

SuggestedRemedy

Per comment. Example below

```
module: ieee802-ethernet-interface
augment /if:interfaces/if:interface:
+--rw ethernet
+--rw auto-negotiation
| +--rw enable: -/-
+--rw duplex: oMACEntity/aDuplexStatus, IEEE Std 802.3, xxxxxxxxxx
+--rw speed: -/-
+--rw flow-control
+--rw pause
| +--rw direction: -/-
+--rw pfc {ethernet-pfc}?
| +--rw enable: -/-
+--rw force-flow-control: -/-
```

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 5 SC 5.2 P23 L12 # 21
 Zhuang, Yan Huawei Technologies

Comment Type T Comment Status D

change "frame-statistics" in table 5-1 accroding to comment #3

SuggestedRemedy

replace "/frame-statistics" with "/statistics/frame"

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

See #Yan-Definitions for details

Changed from E to T

Cl 5 SC 5.2 P23 L49 # 22
 Zhuang, Yan Huawei Technologies

Comment Type T Comment Status D

change"phy-statistics" in table 5-1 accroding to comment #3

SuggestedRemedy

replace "/phy-statistics" with "/statistics/phy";

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

See #Yan-Definitions for details

Changed from E to T

Cl 5 SC 5.2 P23 L52 # 23
 Zhuang, Yan Huawei Technologies

Comment Type T Comment Status D

change"phy-statistics" in table 5-1 accroding to comment #3

SuggestedRemedy

replace "/phy-statistics/lpi" with "/statistics/phy/lpi"

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

See #Yan-Definitions for details

Changed from E to T

Cl 5 SC 5.2 P24 L12 # 24
 Zhuang, Yan Huawei Technologies

Comment Type T Comment Status D

change "mac-control-statistics" in table 5-1 accroding to comment #3

SuggestedRemedy

replace "/mac-control-statistics" with "/statistics/mac-control" in Table 5-1

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

See #Yan-Definitions for details

Changed from E to T

Proposed Responses

IEEE P802.3cf D0.1 YANG Data Model Definitions 1st Task Force review comments

Cl 5 SC 5.2 P24 L43 # 26
 Zhuang, Yan Huawei Technologies
 Comment Type T Comment Status D
 change "/frame-statistics/" in table 5-2 according to comment #8
 SuggestedRemedy
 replace "/frame-statistics/csmacd{csma-cd}" with "/statistics/frame/csmacd{csma-cd}" in table 5-2.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 See #Yan-Definitions for details
 Changed from E to T

Cl 5 SC 5.3.1 P25 L6 # 14
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communicatio
 Comment Type T Comment Status D
 Tree hierarchy contains a lot of nodes marked with "?" which is not explained anywhere in the text
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add introductory note explaining the meaning of "?" symbol in tree hierarchy
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 "?" is for an optional leaf, choice, anydata or any xml.
 Add some introduction for the symbols. According to RFC 6087: "The meaning of the symbols in YANG tree diagrams is as follows. Each node is printed as: <status> <flags> <name> <opts> <type> <if-features> <status> is one of: + for current x for deprecated o for obsolete <flags> is one of: rw for configuration data ro for non-configuration data -x for rpcs and actions -n for notifications <name> is the name of the node (<name>) means that the node is a choice node :(name) means that the node is a case node If the node is augmented into the tree from another module, its name is printed as <prefix>:<name>. <opts> is one of: ? for an optional leaf, choice, anydata or anyxml ! for a presence container * for a leaf-list or list [<keys>] for a list's keys <type> is the name of the type for leafs and leaf-lists If the type is a leafref, the type is printed as ""-> TARGET"", where TARGET is either the leafref path, with prefixed removed if possible. <if-features> is the list of features this node depends on, printed within curly brackets and a question mark ""{...}?""

Cl 5 SC 5.3.1 P25 L6 # 15
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communicatio
 Comment Type T Comment Status D
 Tree hierarchy contains a lot of nodes followed by data type (?) information - the arrangement of these data types is rather haphazard. Some of them are also non-standard and created within the module
 SuggestedRemedy
 As far as listing data types is concered, consider adding ":" after node name, followed by space and data type Alternatively move all data type definitions farther to the right and align them into a single column for better readability
 As far as non-standard data types are concered, suggest to add reference (hyperlink?) to their definition within YANG module - this will at least help reader under what "pause-fc-direction-type" is (for example)
 Similar changes needed in 6.6.1

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED REJECT.
 To be discussed by TF and proper path forward to be selected.

Cl 5 SC 5.3.1 P25 L47 # 20
 Zhuang, Yan Huawei Technologies
 Comment Type T Comment Status D
 There are 3 statistics containers ("frame-statistics", "phy-statitics", "mac-control-statistics"). Merge them into a single "statistics" container and rename these 3 containers by removing "-statitics".
 Update the table 5-1 and YANG codes in 5.3.2 accordingly.
 SuggestedRemedy
 change to:
 +---ro statistics
 +---ro frame
 +- ...
 +---ro phy
 +...
 +---ro mac-control
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 This is comment #Yan-Definitions for reference.
 Changed from E to T

Proposed Responses

IEEE P802.3cf D0.1 YANG Data Model Definitions 1st Task Force review comments

Cl 5 *SC* 5.3.1 *P*26 *L*26 # 25
 Zhuang, Yan Huawei Technologies

Comment Type T *Comment Status* D
 provide a "statistics" container to hold types of different statistics under the ethernet-legacy module

SuggestedRemedy
 create a "statistics" container and move the "frame-statistics" container under it. Rename the "frame-statistics" to "frame" container

Proposed Response *Response Status* W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Changed from E to T

Cl 5 *SC* 5.3.2 *P*38 *L*57 # 27
 Zhuang, Yan Huawei Technologies

Comment Type T *Comment Status* D
 update codes for statistics in ethernet-interface module

SuggestedRemedy
 with latest "ieee802-ethernet-interface.yang"

Proposed Response *Response Status* W
 PROPOSED REJECT.

Changed from E to T

Unclear what the specific change is.

Cl 5 *SC* 5.3.2 *P*50 *L*58 # 28
 Zhuang, Yan Huawei Technologies

Comment Type T *Comment Status* D
 change codes for statistics in ethernet-interface-legacy module

SuggestedRemedy
 replace "eth-if:frame-statistics" with "eth-if:statistics/eth-if:frame"

Proposed Response *Response Status* W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Changed from E to T

Cl 5A *SC* 5A *P*73 *L*0 # 18
 Zhuang, Yan Huawei Technologies

Comment Type E *Comment Status* D
 No line numbers

SuggestedRemedy
 Add line numbers

Proposed Response *Response Status* W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 5A *SC* 5A.2 *P*73 *L*0 # 19
 Zhuang, Yan Huawei Technologies

Comment Type T *Comment Status* D
 Missing managed objects in modules from other standards in annex of Relationship to other standards

SuggestedRemedy
 Add managed objects: dot3HCInPFCFrames and dot3HCOutPFCFrames from ETHERLIKE MIB, etherStatsOctets and (etherStatsUndersizePkts+etherStatsFragments).

Proposed Response *Response Status* W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 6 *SC* 6.1 *P*55 *L*6 # 16
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communicatio

Comment Type E *Comment Status* D
 Subclause 6.1 and 6.2 contain the same type of information: overview

SuggestedRemedy
 Remove heading 6.2 - there is no difference between Introduction and Overview anyway

Proposed Response *Response Status* W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **6** *SC* **6.3** *P***55** *L***25** #

Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communicatio

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **D**

Ethernet interface YANG module is named "ieee802-ethernet-interface" and "ieee802-ethernet-interface-legacy". "ieee802-pse" skips "ethernet" which is important from marketing and identification purposes

SuggestedRemedy

Change module names in Clause 6 adding "ethernet" between "ieee802" and "pse"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.