Cl **00** *SC* **0** *P* **0** *L* **0** # 193

Jones, Peter Cisco

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **X**

I've created a new ieee802-ethernet-mau.yang module to provide similar functionality to ianamau-mib.mib and added some of the MAU related information in ieee802-ethernet-interface.yang.
I will present this to the group in Denver.

SuggestedRemedy

Add the draft ieee802-ethernet-mau.yang module into the draft.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **00** *SC* **0** *P* **0** *L* **0** # 192

Jones, Peter Cisco

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **X**

Please use the pyang utility to produce a common structure/format for the YANG modules. I have drafted a procedure document (802.3 management interface process_0_0.docx) that I intend to review with the group in Denver, including looking at the before and after YANG Text

SuggestedRemedy

Use proposed tools to programatically format the YANG files for consistency

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **00** *SC* **0** *P* **0** *L* **0** # 191

Jones, Peter Cisco

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **X**

minor changes from D1.1. Diffs attached.

SuggestedRemedy

Please make the changes shown in the yang-diffs-peter-jones.txt file

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **1** *SC* **1** *P* **14** *L* **30** # 194

Ran, Adee Cisco

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **X**

"… half-duplex and full-duplex data terminal equipment (DTE) using either Carrier Sense Multiple Access/Collision Detection (CSMA/CD) or Multipoint Control Protocol (MPCP), ..."

Ethernet is no longer just CSMA/CD, for many generations and flavors, and MPCP is not the only alternative to CSMA/CD. The full-duplex MAC in Annex 4A (which is not CSMA/CD) replaced the CSMA/CD MAC of Clause 4 in most of the recent Ethernet specifications.

The term CSMA/CD was removed from the name of 802.3 which is now "Standard for Ethernet".

SuggestedRemedy

Change the quoted text to

"data terminal equipment (DTE) using either half-duplex Carrier Sense Multiple Access/Collision Detection (CSMA/CD), full-duplex point-to-point communication, or Multipoint Control Protocol (MPCP)"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **1** *SC* **1.5** *P* **15** *L* **28** # 195

Ran, Adee Cisco

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **X**

"may be considered sensitive or vulnerable in some network environments"

"may" has a special meaning in standard language, and is arguably not the right word here; anything _may_ be considered vulnerable somewhere. The sentence seems to suggest that these objects _are_ considered sensitive in some environments.

Several similar statements appear in multiple places in the document (I counted 8 instances of "may be considered sensitive").

SuggestedRemedy

Change to "are considered sensitive or vulnerable in some network environments".

Change other instances similarly.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **5** *SC* **5.2** *P* **20** *L* # 196

Ran, Adee Cisco

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **X**

Most of the tables that are in landscape orientation have a lot of white space. It seems that the orientation can be changed to portrait and with some resizing of columns there will be no wraparound (and even if there is it's not a real problme). The tables will be somewhat easier to view this way.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to protrait and resize columns if necessary.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **5** *SC* **5.3** *P* **38** *L* # 197

Ran, Adee Cisco

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **X**

listing text in landscape orientation is inefficient. It seems that the orientation can be changed to portrait and with deletion of some white spaces occasionally there will be no wraparound. The text will be somewhat easier to view this way.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to protrait and remove white space if necessary.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **7** *SC* **7.2** *P* **122** *L* **16** # 198

Ran, Adee Cisco

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **X**

Subclause 7.2 is titled "YANG module structure" but its content is a detailed overview of the EPON technology and its history.

This is in contrast to 5.1, the corresponding "structure" subclause for the Ethernet YANG module, which does indeed describe the structure (without trying to explain Ethernet or its history).

It seems that most of the content of 7.2 should go into the introduction in 7.1 instead, or alternatively be deleted.

SuggestedRemedy

Make 7.2 structure similar to that of 5.1, moving the overview content to 7.1 if necessary.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **7** *SC* **7.2.1** *P* **123** *L* **3** # 199

Ran, Adee Cisco

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **X**

There is also Nx25G-EPON in Clause 141. If it is relevant, it should be added to the list (and corresponding changes should be made to the clause text). Otherwise, it should be explicitly excluded.

SuggestedRemedy

Per comment

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **7** *SC* **7.2.4** *P* **124** *L* **30** # 200

Ran, Adee Cisco

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **X**

Stray "1" in "1defined"

SuggestedRemedy

delete "1"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **7** *SC* **7.4.2** *P* **138** *L* **6** # 201

Ran, Adee Cisco

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **X**

"should any discrepancy between the text of the description for individual YANG nodes and the corresponding definition in 7.2 through 7.4 of this clause occur, the definitions and mappings in 7.4 shall take precedence"

7.4 itself only points to RFC 8407. Since 7.4.2 is within 7.4, it is unclear what potential discrepancy is addressed here, and what takes precedence over what.

SuggestedRemedy

Clarify.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **7** *SC* **7.4.2** *P* **138** *L* **14** # 202

Ran, Adee Cisco

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **X**

footnote number is 0

SuggestedRemedy

fix it

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **8** *SC* **8** *P* **171** *L* **1** # 205

Ran, Adee Cisco

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **X**

The acronym "ELO" appears only once, here in the clause heading, and then in the acronym list. It is not used in the 802.3 standard at all. . Apparently it isn't helpful in this context.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete the acronym here and in the list. Consider renaming to "Ethernet OAM".

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **8** *SC* **8** *P* **171** *L* **1** # 203

Ran, Adee Cisco

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **X**

The structure of clause 8 is very different than that of clauses 5 and 6. The introduction and overview subclauses include a detailed description of the technology which seems unnecessary in this document, and may have discrepancy with the normative definitions in 802.3. Few people will check for such discrepancies; it would be better to point to 802.3 instead.

The structure of clause 5 seems more appropriate.

SuggestedRemedy

Align the structure of this clause to clause 5 and remove the details of the technology.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **8** *SC* **8.1** *P* **171** *L* **7** # 204

Ran, Adee Cisco

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **X**

Clause 8 relates to OAM as if it is a specific feature of Clause 57.

There are other flavors of Ethernet that include OAM. In 802.3-2022, OAM is mentioned in clauses 97, 115, and 149. It seems that these clauses are also relevant here.

If clause 8 is specific to the OAM in clause 57 of 802.3 and not to other usages of this term, then some clarification that other instances are not addressed by this clause is required.

If all flavors of OAM are relevant then the other ones should be listed too.

SuggestedRemedy

Per comment

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**