Cl **00** *SC* *P* *L* # 284

David Tremblay Hewlett Packard Enter

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **R**

Sync up with Lennart Yseboodt to incorporate all new MIBs specific to 802.3bt Power over Ethernet

SuggestedRemedy

Incorporate new 802.3bt D3.3 MIBs into 802.3cf D2.1 for review

Response *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.

Comment type was changed from E to T

P802.3bt is outside of the scope for this project (IEEE Std 802.3-2018, all incorporated amendments, i.e., IEEE Std 802.3bw-2015, IEEE Std 802.3by-2016, IEEE Std 802.3bq-2016, IEEE Std 802.3bp-2016, IEEE Std 802.3br-2016, IEEE Std 802.3bn-2016, IEEE Std 802.3bz-2016, IEEE Std 802.3bu-2016, IEEE Std 802.3bv-2017 IEEE Std 802.3bs-2017, IEEE Std 802.3cc-2017, and IEEE Std 802.3-2015/Cor 1-2017)

Cl **FM** *SC* **FM** *P* *L* # 227

Anslow, Pete Ciena

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **A** *bucket*

The table of contents does not seem to use the TOC format from the 802.3 template.
The line for 8.4 wraps improperly with the page number on the left.
The line for Annex 5A does not include (informative) or the title

SuggestedRemedy

Format the TOC as per the 802.3 template.

Response *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT.

Cl **FM** *SC* **FM** *P* **1** *L* **1** # 270

Healey, Adam Broadcom Ltd.

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *bucket*

The project number is "P802.3.2" and not "P802.3cf". Under these circumstances, the reference should be "IEEE P802.3.2 (IEEE 802.3cf)" or in the case of page 1/line 1 just "IEEE P802.3.2". See IEEE 802.3.1, various revisions, corrigenda, etc. for examples.

SuggestedRemedy

Update references to "P802.3cf" accordingly.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **FM** *SC* **FM** *P* **7** *L* **4** # 269

Healey, Adam Broadcom Ltd.

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *bucket*

The officers and members at the beginning of the "IEEE P802.3cc" working group ballot are not relevant for this project.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "IEEE P802.3cc" to "IEEE P802.3.2 (IEEE 802.3cf)".

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **FM** *SC* **FM** *P* **12** *L* **66** # 192

Hajduczenia, Charter

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *bucket, copyright year*

Copyright release year shows as 2017

SuggestedRemedy

Change all copyright year entries from 2017 to 2018

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **FM** *SC* **FM** *P* **13** *L* **1** # 249

Yseboodt, Lennart Philips Lighting

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **A** *bucket, page numbers*

There is a jump in page numbers from page 9 (last page of the frontmatter) to page 13 (first page of the TOC).

Unfortunately this will wreak havoc on your comments as you will get a mix of comments against the PDF page number and comments against the physical page number.

SuggestedRemedy

Fix page numbering.

Response *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT.

Cl **00** *SC* *P* **26** *L* **14** # 237
Franchuk, Brian Emerson Automation

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *bucket*

"statitics" should be "statistics" (missing 's')

SuggestedRemedy

Fix spelling

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **00** *SC* *P* **26** *L* **17** # 238
Franchuk, Brian Emerson Automation

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *bucket*

"statitics" should be "statistics" (missing 's')

SuggestedRemedy

Fix spelling.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **00** *SC* *P* **63** *L* # 239
Franchuk, Brian Emerson Automation

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *bucket*

Page content is clipped.

SuggestedRemedy

Fit content to page or use alternate page format (landscape).

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **00** *SC* **0** *P* *L* # 229
Anslow, Pete Ciena

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *bucket*

Recent standards published by IEEE (and the 802.3 template) do not force each Clause to start on even or odd pages, so there should be no blank pages between clauses.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the blank pages between clauses

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **00** *SC* **0** *P* *L* # 228
Anslow, Pete Ciena

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **A** *TBDs*

The draft contains numerous occurrences of "TBD"

SuggestedRemedy

Replace them with suitable text. Until this is done, the draft is not ready to progress to Sponsor ballot (hence Required comment).

Response *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Several TBD instances are addressed by individual comments. The remaining items are addressed below:

- in "feature csma-cd {", remove reference
- in "leaf mpcp-logical-link-admin-state {", use the following reference "IEEE Std 802.3.1, dot3ExtPkgObjectRegisterAction "
- in leaf "leaf mpcp-logical-link-count" use the followign reference "IEEE Std 802.3.1, dot3ExtPkgObjectNumberOfLLIDs"
- in leaf "leaf mpcp-maximum-queue-count-per-report", use the following reference "IEEE Std 802.3.1, dot3ExtPkgObjectReportMaximumNumQueues"

Add reference to IEEE Std 802.3.1-2013 into Clause 2.

Cl **00** *SC* **0** *P* *L* # 226
Anslow, Pete Ciena

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *bucket, copyright year*

The copyright year is not consistent throughout the draft.
The front matter has 2018, but the TOC has 2013 and the rest of the draft has 2017.

SuggestedRemedy

Make the copyright year 2018 in all sections of the draft.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **00** *SC* **0** *P* **1** *L* **1** # 236

Kolesar, Paul CommScope

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **R**

This global comment pertains to meeting the Criteria for Standards Development (CSD), and specifically to the Compatibility criteria. Item e) of the Compatibility criteria requires "Managed object definitions compatible with SNMP". However, this project is defining an alternative to the SNMP model for managed objects that does not meet this criterion. It is claimed in the CSD responses that this criterion is not applicable for this project. Options to remove this incongruence include discontinuation of this project or modification of the compatibility criteria.

SuggestedRemedy

Modify the Compatibility criteria item e) to either:
1) removed the managed object requirement,
2) add YANG as an alternative,
3) replace SNMP with YANG,
4) make the requirement ambivalent to the model.
The commenter's preference is option 2).

Response *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.

While the commenter is correct in his observation, we encourage the commenter to bring this observation to the attention of the 802 / 802.3WG at large, since it affects all projects, not just this one.

Cl **00** *SC* **0** *P* **9** *L* **1** # 277

Healey, Adam Broadcom Ltd.

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *bucket, page numbers*

Pages numbers seem to jump around a bit and get out of sync with the PDF page number.

SuggestedRemedy

Update the page numbers to align with the PDF page numbers.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **00** *SC* **0** *P* **9** *L* **55** # 285

Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI,

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *bucket, page numbers*

The page numbers jump from 9 to 13 Comments will reference the page in teh PDF, not the printed document

SuggestedRemedy

Please fix page numbering

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **00** *SC* **0** *P* **10** *L* **1** # 197

McDermott, Thomas retired

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **A** *bucket, page numbers*

Pages 10, 11, 12 are missing from the PDF document. The page number text footer on the page skips from page 9 on the 9th page of the pdf file to page 13 on the 10th page of the pdf file.

SuggestedRemedy

Re do the page numbers throughout the document.

Response *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT.

Cl **00** *SC* **0** *P* **10** *L* **60** # 205

Slavick, Jeff Broadcom Ltd

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *bucket, page numbers*

Page number 10-12 are skipped for some reason so now the page numbers at the bottom of the page don't align with the PDF page numbers.

SuggestedRemedy

Fix the skipping of pages 10-12 when the TOC is inserted

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **00** *SC* **0** *P* **31** *L* **28** # 382

Jethanandani, Mahesh Xoriant

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *from-the-floor, rfc7223*

Import of iana-if-types does not carry a reference statement. See Section 3.9, RFC6087bis

SuggestedRemedy

Add reference statement in the import. Example - reference "RFC 7223 IETF Interface YANG model (as of this publication)

Response *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Comment type changed from ER to E (commenter is not an 802.3 WG balloter)

Add reference statement in the import. reference "RFC 7223"

No changes to content in Clause 2 is needed (RFC 7223 already present).

Cl **00** *SC* **0** *P* **31** *L* **28** # 381

Jethanandani, Mahesh Xoriant

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *from-the-floor, rfc7223*

Import of ietf-interfaces does not carry a reference statement. See Section 3.9, RFC6087bis

SuggestedRemedy

Add reference statement in the import. Example - reference "RFC 7223 IETF Interface YANG model (as of this publication)

Response *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Comment type changed from ER to E (commenter is not an 802.3 WG balloter)

Add reference statement in the import. reference "RFC 7223"

No changes to content in Clause 2 is needed (RFC 7223 already present).

Cl **00** *SC* **0** *P* **32** *L* **2** # 372

Jethanandani, Mahesh Xoriant

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *from-the-floor*

Revision of intermediate versions not needed. See Section 4.8 of RFC6087bis

SuggestedRemedy

The revision statement should be a placeholder like YYYY-MM-DD and replaced with a date when the model is *published* (available for public consumption)

Response *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Comment type changed from ER to E (commenter is not an 802.3 WG balloter)

Remove all revision statements from all YANG modules in the draft at this time. Insert Editorial note indicating that revision information needs to be added at the time of publication of the standard.

Cl **00** *SC* **0** *P* **32** *L* **25** # 373

Jethanandani, Mahesh Xoriant

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **R** *from-the-floor, speed*

Why was the units chosen to be Gb/s instead of say Mb/s, i.e. use decimal points to represent speed instead of decimal numbers to represent speed?

SuggestedRemedy

Use Mb/s and scale up from there to represent speeds.

Response *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.

Most of newer 802.3 PHYs are multi gigabit PHYs, with the newest design reaching 400Gb/s. 400 000 Mb/s was deemed as less readable than 400 Gb/s. The lowest speed i.e., 10 Mbps is easily represetable as 0.01 Gb/s.

Cl **00** *SC* **0** *P* **34** *L* **57** # 374

Jethanandani, Mahesh Xoriant

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A** *from-the-floor*

It says in the description that the default in for duplex is enabled. Why is there no default statement for the leaf.

SuggestedRemedy

Add - default true to the leaf.

Response *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Comment type changed from TR to T (commenter is not an 802.3 WG balloter)

Insert statement "default true;" under "type boolean;" in "leaf enable"

Cl **00** *SC* **0** *P* **35** *L* **49** # 375

Jethanandani, Mahesh Xoriant

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **R** *from-the-floor, speed*

Same comment as row 25

SuggestedRemedy

Use Mb/s and scale up from there to represent speeds.

Response *Response Status* **W**

REJECT.

Comment type changed from TR to T (commenter is not an 802.3 WG balloter)

See comment #373

Cl **00** *SC* **0** *P* **36** *L* **24** # 376

Jethanandani, Mahesh Xoriant

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A** *from-the-floor, deep-stats*

Statistics container is deep inside a configuration node. That makes request of all statistics for a given interface painful for the client. It has to filter the <get> response for config false nodes.

SuggestedRemedy

Consolidate statistics inside a single container that has all the statistics for a given interface. That way the client can request for one container and get all the statistics for that interface.

Response *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Comment type changed from TR to T (commenter is not an 802.3 WG balloter)

Per page 29 (module structure), interface global statistics container is at the top level of the module, extending statistics of the augmented /if:interfaces/if:interface: instance. Statistics associated with PAUSE and PFC are better off located under PAUSE and PFC specific sub-trees. PFC sub-tree is present only if feature is supported.

Add a new feature under feature ethernet-pfc as follows

```
feature ethernet-pause {
  description
    "This device supports Ethernet PAUSE";
}
```

Add the following statement under "container pause" (with proper indentation)

if-feature "ethernet-pause";

Cl **00** SC **0** P **37** L **24** # 377

Jethanandani, Mahesh Xoriant

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **R** *from-the-floor*

Does the enable flag have a default value. If not, why not? Note, in YANG, the model can indicate a default value. If a particular implementation does not support the default value, they can override the default

SuggestedRemedy

Set the default to true/false depending on what most implementations do.

Response *Response Status* **W**

REJECT.

Comment type changed from TR to T (commenter is not an 802.3 WG balloter)

Leaf description is clear enough at this time. There is no historical default value, it is expected to be set by the device itself depending on its confguration. Setting a default value might put existing compliant implementations into a non-compliant state.

Cl **00** SC **0** P **37** L **47** # 378

Jethanandani, Mahesh Xoriant

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A** *from-the-floor, deep-stats*

Same comment as row 13

SuggestedRemedy

Consolidate statistics inside a single container that has all the statistics for a given interface. That way the client can request for one container and get all the statistics for that interface.

Response *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Comment type changed from TR to T (commenter is not an 802.3 WG balloter)

See comment #376

Cl **00** SC **0** P **39** L **6** # 379

Jethanandani, Mahesh Xoriant

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **R** *from-the-floor*

Can leaf max-frame-len carry a default value? 1522?

SuggestedRemedy

Add a default value for the leaf.

Response *Response Status* **W**

REJECT.

Comment type changed from TR to T (commenter is not an 802.3 WG balloter)

Clause 30 aMaxFrameLength attribute contains no default value definition.

There is no historical default value, it is expected to be set by the device itself depending on its confguration. Setting a default value might put existing compliant implementations into a non-compliant state.

Cl **00** SC **0** P **175** L # 276

Healey, Adam Broadcom Ltd.

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *annex-5a*

[PDF page 174]. The contents of 5A.1 is "<some text>". The draft looks incomplete. Furthermore, 5A.2 looks like an instruction for future work. Is more content anticipated here?

SuggestedRemedy

Include suitable content in Annex 5A or remove the annex.

Response *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Remove Annex 5A

Cl **00** *SC* **6.5.2** *P* **67** *L* **3** # 266

Lapak, Jeff UNH-IOL

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A**

Either the word following is wrong or this sentence has no effect.

"In the following YANG module definition, should any discrepancy between the DESCRIPTION text and the corresponding definition in 6.2 through 6.5 of this clause occur, the definitions in 6.2 through 6.5 shall take precedence."

SuggestedRemedy

Change sentence to the following (mostly copied from clause 5.4.2 for consistency)

"In the following YANG module definition, should any discrepancy between the DESCRIPTION text and the corresponding definition in 6.2 through 6.5 of this clause occur, the definitions and mappings in 6.5 shall take precedence."

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **1** *SC* **1** *P* **13** *L* **4** # 302

Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI,

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A**

The overview should mirror what is the scope of IEEE Standard 802.3. IEEE Std 802.3-2015 refers to legacy only when referring to devices which existed prior to their inclusion in 802.3. Specifically, it does not refer to shared CSMA/CD as "legacy". Additionally, according to the draft 3.0 of IEEE P802.3bt, "Power over Ethernet" is a defined term which does NOT include PoDL.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "This document defines YANG modules for legacy shared (CSMA/CD) and dedicated links in point-to-point and point-to-multipoint architectures (Ethernet Passive Optical Networks, EPON), as well as Power over Ethernet (PoE) ports, as specified in IEEE Std 802.3-2015." to "This document defines YANG modules for shared media Ethernet links using CSMA/CD, dedicated Ethernet links in point-to-point and point-to-multipoint architectures (Ethernet Passive Optical Networks, EPON), as well as associated powering over selected twisted pair PHY types (Power over Ethernet and Power over Data Lines, as specified in IEEE Std 802.3-2015."

Response *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Extra text on Link OAM added to address comment #329

Note that by the time this project is finished, IEEE Std 802.3-2018 will be published, so we can as well align with definitions included therein.

Change
"This document defines YANG modules for legacy shared (CSMA/CD) and dedicated links in point-to-point and point-to-multipoint architectures (Ethernet Passive Optical Networks, EPON), as well as Power over Ethernet (PoE) ports, as specified in IEEE Std 802.3-2015."

to

"This document defines YANG modules for shared media Ethernet links using CSMA/CD, dedicated Ethernet links in point-to-point and point-to-multipoint architectures (Ethernet Passive Optical Networks, EPON), associated Ethernet Link OAM, as well as associated powering over selected twisted pair PHY types (Power over Ethernet and Power over Data Lines), as specified in IEEE Std 802.3."

Cl **1** *SC* **1** *P* **13** *L* **6** # 353

Trowbridge, Steve Nokia

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **A**

As this project will finish after the revision project, it should be up-to-date with IEEE Std 802.3-2018.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the reference to IEEE Std 802.3-2015 to 802.3-2018. Check revision for any modifications that affect the model.

Response *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The PAR and objetives are not project date specific - TF needs to figure out what the cut off is, i.e., everytihng that is in planned 802.3-2018: IEEE Std 802.3bw-2015, IEEE Std 802.3by-2016, IEEE Std 802.3bq-2016, IEEE Std 802.3bp-2016, IEEE Std 802.3br-2016, IEEE Std 802.3bn-2016, IEEE Std 802.3bz-2016, IEEE Std 802.3bu-2016, IEEE Std 802.3bv-2017 IEEE Std 802.3bs-2017, IEEE Std 802.3cc-2017, and IEEE Std 802.3-2015/Cor 1-2017.

Update all dated references to 802.3 from 2015 to 2018 with editorial note in Clause 2 indicating it is in Sponsor Ballot at this time.

Cl **1** *SC* **1** *P* **13** *L* **6** # 329

Remein, Duane Huawei

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A**

This para mentions everything except Etherenet Link OAM.

SuggestedRemedy

Add Ethernet Link OAM to the list of YANG modules defined.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Comment type was changed from E to T

See comment #302.

Cl **1** *SC* **1** *P* **14** *L* **66** # 194

Hajduczenia, Charter

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *bucket, page numbers*

Page numbering out of whack

SuggestedRemedy

Page number in PDF does not match the page number displayed at the top of the PDF reader

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **1** *SC* **1** *P* **16** *L* **11** # 315

Cheng, Weiying Coriant

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *bucket*

term 'this new functionality' mislead just one functionality, suggest to use new funcitonalities.

SuggestedRemedy

replace 'this new functionality' with 'new functionalities'.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **1** *SC* **1.2** *P* **13** *L* **27** # 330

Powell, Bill Nokia

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

The 1st Paragraph in this section gives the github location for the Yang modules that are part of this standard. The next paragraph notes that formatting may not be preserved when importing machine readable files into PDF. It would be helpful to the reader to suggest use of a Yang editor tool such as Pyang.

SuggestedRemedy

Add the following to the end of the first paragraph (or equivalent):
"Use of a specialized tool such as open source Pyang to view Yang models may be useful to create tree, uml image, and html outputs from the Yang model, as well as supporting Lint and Syntax checking."

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

There are various tools available online, including free and paid tools. It is typically the view of 802.3 at large not to promote any specific tool, where choices exist. Terminology and spelling was also aligned in the proposed text shown below.

Add the following to the end of the first paragraph:
"The use of specialized tools to view YANG modules may be useful to create tree, UML image, and HTML outputs from the YANG modules."

Cl **1** *SC* **1.2** *P* **16** *L* **34** # 200

Hidaka, Yasuo Independent

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *bucket*

It may be preferred to write "may not be preserved" than "may be not preserved."

SuggestedRemedy

Change "may be not preserved" to "may not be preserved.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **1** *SC* **1.3** *P* **13** *L* **42** # 242

Marris, Arthur Cadence Design Syste

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *TBDs*

There are a number of "TBD" statements in the draft. These need to be updated with relevant text.

SuggestedRemedy

Address the TBDs on pages 13, 38, 41, 50, 99, 139, 140 and 145.

Response *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #193 for TBD in 1.3
See comment #228 for all remaining TBDs

Cl **1** *SC* **1.3** *P* **13** *L* **42** # 204

Slavick, Jeff Broadcom Ltd

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **A** *TBD in 1.3*

Section 1.3 is TBD

SuggestedRemedy

Either insert appropriate text describing the YANG framework or remove the section

Response *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #193

Cl **1** *SC* **1.3** *P* **13** *L* **43** # 193

Hajduczenia, Charter

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A** *TBD in 1.3*

Content missing in 1.3

SuggestedRemedy

Use the following text: "The structure of YANG-based management framework resembles closely the structure of the Internet-Standard Management Framework, described in detail section 7 of IETF RFC 3410.
Managed objects defined using YANG modelling language are hosted on the managed device and accessed through NETCONF (see IETF RFC 6241) or RESTCONF (see IETF RFC 8040). This standard specifies YANG modules that are compliant to YANG 1.1 (see IETF RFC 7950)."

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Use the following text: "The structure of YANG-based management framework closely resembles the structure of the Internet-Standard Management Framework, described in detail in section 7 of IETF RFC 3410.
Managed objects defined using YANG modelling language are hosted on the managed device and accessed through NETCONF (see IETF RFC 6241) or RESTCONF (see IETF RFC 8040). This standard specifies YANG modules that are compliant to YANG 1.1 (see IETF RFC 7950)."

Cl **1** *SC* **1.3** *P* **13** *L* **43** # 303

Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI,

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **A** *TBD in 1.3*

"{TBD}" - what is supposed to go here? Assuming we are technically complete I marked this editorial.

SuggestedRemedy

Please fill in or delete the subclause

Response *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #193

Cl **1** *SC* **1.3** *P* **16** *L* **40** # 201

Hidaka, Yasuo Independent

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *TBD in 1.3*

The body of clause 1.3 is just TBD.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove clause 1.3.
Or, write the body of clause 1.3.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #193

Cl **1** *SC* **1.3** *P* **16** *L* **42** # 271

Healey, Adam Broadcom Ltd.

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *TBD in 1.3*

The contents of subclause 1.3 are "{TBD}". The draft looks incomplete.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace {TBD} with appropriate content or delete the subclause.

Response *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #193

Cl **1** *SC* **1.3** *P* **16** *L* **42** # 316

Cheng, Weiying Coriant

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *TBD in 1.3*

Need to have contents for review or remove this clause.

SuggestedRemedy

Response *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #193

Cl **1** *SC* **1.4** *P* **17** *L* **7** # 246

Winkel, Ludwig Siemens AG

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **A** *bucket*

Missing full stop at the end of the sentence

SuggestedRemedy

Add full stop at the end of the sentence

Response *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT.

Cl **2** *SC* **2** *P* **16** *L* **4** # 250

Yseboodt, Lennart Philips Lighting

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **R**

"(i.e., they must be understood and used, so each referenced document is cited in text and its relationship to this document is explained)."

The word 'must' is not appropriate standards language.
We cannot putn requirements on our readers.

SuggestedRemedy

"(i.e., they should be understood and used, so each referenced document is cited in text and its relationship to this document is explained)."

Response *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.

Text is part of the template and adopted verbatim from the official 802.3 template.

Cl **2** *SC* **2** *P* **16** *L* **9** # 233

Anslow, Pete Ciena

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *missing 802.3 reference*

IEEE Std 802.3 is referred to many times but is not included in the references

SuggestedRemedy

Add IEEE Std 802.3 to the references

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Add reference to 802.3-2018 with editorial note that it is in Sponsor ballot, to be removed once it is officially published.

Cl **2** *SC* **2** *P* **16** *L* **35** # 286

Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI,

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A** *missing 802.3 reference*

I would think IEEE Std 802.3 would be essential for understanding this document, since it details the parameters...

SuggestedRemedy

Add IEEE Std. 802.3-2015 to the normative references

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #233

Cl **3** *SC* **3** *P* **21** *L* **10** # 317

Cheng, Weiying Coriant

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A**

Miss RESTCONF-based operations since it can access Yang module as well

SuggestedRemedy

Replace 'NETCONF-based operations' with 'NETCONF-based and RESTCONF-based operations

Response *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT.

Cl **3** *SC* **3** *P* **21** *L* **65** # 272

Healey, Adam Broadcom Ltd.

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *bucket*

[PDF page 18]. Footnote 1 refers to Annex A. There is no Annex A in this draft.

SuggestedRemedy

As there also appears to be no "numbers in brackets", delete the footnote.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **3** *SC* **3.2** *P* **18** *L* **12** # 195

Hajduczenia, Charter

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A** *bucket*

>>"compilable"<< is not really a word

SuggestedRemedy

Change to "can be compiled"

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **3** *SC* **3.2** *P* **21** *L* **12** # 251

Yseboodt, Lennart Philips Lighting

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *bucket*

The word "compatible" is between straight quotes (likely from copy/paste. This needs to be replaced by open and close quotation marks.

SuggestedRemedy

Per comment.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

There is no "compatible" but "compilable". See comment #195

Cl **4** *SC* *P* **20** *L* **4** # 241

Marris, Arthur Cadence Design Syste

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *term definition*

TERM looks like it is an abbreviation for something. This is confusing.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace line 4 with:
This standard contains the following abbreviations:

Consider adding CO, CPE, EFM, OAM and ELO to the list of abbreviations.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #206

Add the following abbreviations

CO = Central Office
CPE = Customer Premise Equipment
EFM = Ethernet in the First Mile
OAM = Operations, Administration, and Maintenance
ELO = Ethernet Link OAM

Cl **4** *SC* **4** *P* **20** *L* **4** # 196

Hajduczenia, Charter

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *term definition*

Remove line "TERM definition"

SuggestedRemedy

It is a left over from early draft days

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

See comment #206

Cl **4** *SC* **4** *P* **20** *L* **4** # 206

Slavick, Jeff Broadcom Ltd

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *term definition*

The line "TERM definition" is a heading for the columns of information that follow. I thought you were stating the abbrevaition of TERM was defintion and thus were missing a defintion for "TERM".

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the line "TERM definition" and replace with the same sentence the base standards has "This standard contains the following abbreviations:"

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **4** *SC* **4** *P* **23** *L* **4** # 252

Yseboodt, Lennart Philips Lighting

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A** *term definition*

In the abbreviations we have:
"TERM definition"

SuggestedRemedy

Delete "TERM definition"

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

See comment #206

Cl **4** *SC* **4** *P* **23** *L* **4** # 273

Healey, Adam Broadcom Ltd.

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *term definition*

[PDF page 20]. Is "TERM" an abbreviation for "definition"?

SuggestedRemedy

Introduce the list of abbreviations as done in IEEE Std 802.3-2015 1.5 and delete this row.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #206

Cl **4** *SC* **4** *P* **23** *L* **8** # 318

Cheng, Weiying Coriant

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A**

Miss RESTCONF

SuggestedRemedy

Add 'RESTCONF Restful Configuration Protocol'

Response *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

On the first use of RESTCONF, add reference to IETF RFC 8040. The same for NETCONF.

Remove NETCONF from Clause 4.

Cl **5** *SC* **5.1** *P* **25** *L* **4** # 244

Winkel, Ludwig Siemens AG

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A** *bucket*

Clause 5.1 does not contain more information as in 5.2 and does not contain sufficient information for providing an introduction.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete 5.1

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **5** *SC* **5.1** *P* **25** *L* **13** # 247

Winkel, Ludwig Siemens AG

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **A** *bucket*

"this clause" is ambiguous, see also style guide.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace by "Clause 5"

Response *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Text deleted under comment #244

Cl **5** *SC* **5.2** *P* **22** *L* **14** # 287

Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI,

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *eth-legacy*

The division of attributes into widely used and not widely used is arbitrary and with a narrow basis, and could be considered 'picking favorites'. A better partition would be to divide into the active and the deprecated parts of IEEE Std 802.3, specifically management for CSMA/CD networks. CSMA/CD has not been deprecated, is still in use (yes, there are still hubs out there), and 802.3cg is currently developing PHYs using CSMA/CD for multiple access.

SuggestedRemedy

Repartitiion between active and deprecated clauses of IEEE Std 802.3

Response *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #268

Cl **5** *SC* **5.2** *P* **25** *L* **12** # 319

Cheng, Weiying Coriant

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *bucket*

replace 'focused' with 'to be focused on'

SuggestedRemedy

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change

"Two modules are defined in this clause focused"

to

"Two modules defined in this clause are focused"

Cl **5** *SC* **5.2** *P* **25** *L* **15** # 268

Jones, Peter Cisco

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *eth-legacy*

The text says "while the ieee802-ethernet-interface-legacy YANG module contains definitions of legacy attributes, no longer widely used in the industry. The legacy attributes are maintained for backwards compatibility purposes."

Given that 802.3cg 10SPE is currently working on half duplex and CSMA/CD, locating CSMA/CD in a module called "legacy" is not correct. I was involved in this process, but give active work in 802.3cg, I no longer think that this is correct. I also think that the 802.3cf TF is probably not the correct place to make this "labelling" decision.

SuggestedRemedy

Move objects relateed to half-duplex & CSMA/CD out of ieee802-ethernet-interface-legacy augment /if:interfaces/if:interface/eth-if and back into ieee802-ethernet-interface. Alternatively - reconsider the model groupings/labelling to remove the implication that half-duplex & CSMA/CD are now "legacy"

Response *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Rename "legacy" module, i.e., "ieee802-ethernet-interface-legacy" to "ieee802-ethernet-interface-half-duplex"

Strike "status deprecated" in 5.4.2.2 module globally.

In 5.2, replace "definitions of legacy attributes, no longer widely used in the industry" with "definitions of half-duplex attributes". Strike "The legacy attributes are maintained for backwards compatibility purposes."

In 5.4.2.2, change prefix "eth-legacy" to "eth-half-duplex"

In 7.3.2, remove import in lines 29-31, since it is commented out anyway

Cl **5** *SC* **5.2** *P* **25** *L* **16** # 320

Cheng, Weiying Coriant

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A** *eth-legacy*

What are critiera to classify so call lagacy attributes? If they are not widely used in the industry, why we need to define Yang Modules?

SuggestedRemedy

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #268

Cl **5** *SC* **5.3** *P* **23** *L* **1** # 210

Slavick, Jeff Broadcom Ltd

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **R**

Table 5-1 and Table 5-2 seem to be mapping the YANG items to existing Cluae 30/MIB attributes/objects. But the Table has the "source" (YANG) on the right side.

SuggestedRemedy

reverse the table to have the Yang data nodes in the first thee columns and the "correspoding Clause 30" entries on the right side

Response *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.

Current format is readable, i.e., an existing Clause 30 attribute is mapped into an object in the YANG module. This helps with reading and mapping content from IEEE Std, Clause 30.

Cl **5** *SC* **5.3** *P* **23** *L* **9** # 211

Slavick, Jeff Broadcom Ltd

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A**

Doesn't the auto-negotiation/enable correspond to aAutoNegAdminControl

SuggestedRemedy

Change N/A N/A to oAutoNegotiaion aAutoNegAdminControl

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **5** *SC* **5.3** *P* **23** *L* **9** # 212

Slavick, Jeff Broadcom Ltd

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A**

Doesn't the auto-negotiation/status correspond to aAutoNegAutoConfig

SuggestedRemedy

Change N/A N/A to oAutoNegotiaion aAutoNegAutoConfig

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **5** *SC* **5.3** *P* **24** *L* **9** # 207

Slavick, Jeff Broadcom Ltd

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A** *RMON*

For the in-total-pkts row you assign a Managed Object but use a "no direct object" attribute which does not exist in Clause 30. Previsouly for a Data node without a correpsonding Clause 30 Attribute the use of N/A N/A was done.

SuggestedRemedy

Move the footnote a to be on the in-total-pkts and change Clause 30 fields to be N/A N/A

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Extract all attributes pointing to MIBs / RFCs to a separate table from Table 5-1 (table 5-1a, to become Table 5-2 once renumbered), with the following columns: attribute | reference | container | data node(s) | R/W, where 3 last columns are spanning across with a single caption "Corresponding ieee802-ethernet-interface YANG data nodes"

Move the following attributes to new Table 5-1a: in-total-pkts, in-total-octets, in-error-undersize-pkts

No changes to existing Table 5-2. Add appropriate references to Table 5-1/5-2.

Add reference in Clause 2 to RFC 2819 RMON (https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/rfc2819/?include_text=1). Use RFC 2819 instead of RMON MIB reference in new Table 5-1a.

Cl **5** *SC* **5.3** *P* **24** *L* **11** # 208

Slavick, Jeff Broadcom Ltd

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A** *RMON*

etherStatsOctets is not a MIB that I could find. I think it's referring to "rptrMonitorPortReadableOctets or rptrMonitorPortHCReadableOctets" which is the octets received.

SuggestedRemedy

Update the Attribute to refer to an object found in 802.3.1

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #207

Cl **5** *SC* **5.3** *P* **24** *L* **22** # 209

Slavick, Jeff Broadcom Ltd

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A** *RMON*

etherStatsUndersizePkts and etherStatsFragments are not MIBs that I could find.

SuggestedRemedy

Update the Attribute to refer to an object found in 802.3.1

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #207

Cl **5** *SC* **5.3** *P* **25** *L* **26** # 274

Healey, Adam Broadcom Ltd.

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *missing 802.3 reference*

[PDF page 22]. A [presumably normative] reference to IEEE Std 802.3 is made here (and elsewhere) but IEEE 802.3 is not in the list of normative references.

SuggestedRemedy

Add IEEE Std 802.3 to the list of normative references.

Response *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT.

See comment #233

Cl **5** *SC* **5.3** *P* **26** *L* **1** # 253

Yseboodt, Lennart Philips Lighting

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **R**

The rotated pages are an annoyance, especially in print and as such should be avoided when possible.
For the mapping table there does not seem to be a need to flip the page. The text in the "Container(s)" column data can easily be split over multiple lines (it is mostly empty space now) and this colum made less wide. This allows these pages to be oriented in the portrait fashion.

SuggestedRemedy

Decrease width of "COntainer(s)" column and make pages portrait.

Response *Response Status* **W**

REJECT.

Current structure optimizes readability. Initial draft versions had portrait page layout and received a lot of comments on problems with readability.

Cl **5** *SC* **5.3** *P* **26** *L* **15** # 216

Graber, Steffen Pepperl+Fuchs GmbH

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *bucket*

statitics (missing 's' within statistics)

SuggestedRemedy

statistics

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **5** *SC* **5.3** *P* **26** *L* **17** # 217

Graber, Steffen Pepperl+Fuchs GmbH

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *bucket*

statitics (missing 's' within statistics)

SuggestedRemedy

statistics

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **5** *SC* **5.3** *P* **26** *L* **41** # 202

Hidaka, Yasuo Independent

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *bucket*

A border line on the bottom side of Table 5-1 is missing.

Same for Table 6-1 in page 62, and Table 8-1 in page 146, and page 147.

SuggestedRemedy

Add the missing border line.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **5** *SC* **5.3** *P* **27** *L* **11** # 333

Trowbridge, Steve Nokia

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **R**

The attribute etherStatsOctets is mapped to the YANG data node in-total-octets in the container interfaces/interface/ethernet/statistics/frame. The generic interface model of IETF RFC 7223 (and its draft rework for NMDA) does already contain the YANG data node in-octets. The understood result is that the same counter is provided twice. Intended?

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the YANG data node in-total-octets from the container interfaces/interface/ethernet/statistics/frame, and indicate in Table 5-1 that the attribute is mapped to the generic interface data node in-octets as defined in RFC 7223.
If not accepted to remove this YANG data node, then it should be clarified whether in addition the generic interface statistics are relevant. See also comment on page 33, line 57.

Response *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.

It was decided that it is beneficial for implementers and readers to have all Ethernet-related statistics in a single location in the module under interfaces/interface/ethernet/statistics/frame, rather than have them at different levels.

Cl **5** *SC* **5.3** *P* **27** *L* **16** # 334

Trowbridge, Steve Nokia

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **R**

Same issue as comment on line 11 for the attribute aMulticastFramesReceivedOK. This is redundant with in-multicast-pkts as defined in RFC 7223.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the YANG data node in-multicast-pkts from the container interfaces/interface/ethernet/statistics/frame, and indicate in Table 5-1 that the attribute is mapped to the generic interface data node in-multicast-pkts as defined in RFC 7223.

Response *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.

See comment #333

Cl **5** *SC* **5.3** *P* **27** *L* **18** # 335

Trowbridge, Steve Nokia

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **R**

Same issue as comments on lines 11&16 for the attribute aBroadcastFramesReceivedOK. This is redundant with in-broadcast-pkts as defined in RFC 7223.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the YANG data node in-broadcast-pkts from the container interfaces/interface/ethernet/statistics/frame, and indicate in Table 5-1 that the attribute is mapped to the generic interface data node in-broadcast-pkts as defined in RFC 7223.

Response *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.

See comment #333

Cl **5** *SC* **5.3** *P* **27** *L* **30** # 336

Trowbridge, Steve Nokia

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **R**

Same issue as comments on lines 11, 16, 18 for the attribute aMulticastFramesXmittedOK. This is redundant with out-multicast-pkts as defined in RFC 7223.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the YANG data node out-multicast-pkts from the container interfaces/interface/ethernet/statistics/frame, and indicate in Table 5-1 that the attribute is mapped to the generic interface data node out-multicast-pkts as defined in RFC 7223.

Response *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.

See comment #333

Cl **5** *SC* **5.3** *P* **27** *L* **32** # 337

Trowbridge, Steve Nokia

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **R**

Same issue as comments on lines 11, 16, 17, 30 for the attribute aBroadcastFramesXmittedOK. This is redundant with out-broadcast-pkts as defined in RFC 7223.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the YANG data node out-broadcast-pkts from the container interfaces/interface/ethernet/statistics/frame, and indicate in Table 5-1 that the attribute is mapped to the generic interface data node out-broadcast-pkts as defined in RFC 7223.

Response *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.

See comment #333

Cl **5** *SC* **5.4** *P* *L* **29** # 245

Winkel, Ludwig Siemens AG

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A** *bucket*

Same title as in 5.4.2 is confusing.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace one of the titles, so that there is a difference.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Replace heading for 5.4.2, 6.5.2, 7.3.2, 8.5.2, to read "YANG module structure"

Cl **5** *SC* **5.4** *P* **29** *L* **1** # 254

Yseboodt, Lennart Philips Lighting

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **R**

The document provides a URL to a github repository for the machine readable version of the YANG models and states that in case of a discrepancy these prevail over the version included in the PDF.

This is clear and seems correct to me.
I however question the value of including a printed dump of these YANG models in the standard. It will be maintenance intensive to keep these two in sync.

SuggestedRemedy

Task force to consider NOT including the Yang models in the draft in full, but rather focus on requirements and descriptive text. Possible show some core objects or show a few examples.

Response *Response Status* **W**

REJECT.

The published 802.3 standards are intended to be self contained, i.e., any external content is for ease of importing machine readable documents, and not required for proper understanding of the draft.

The same document structure was also used for IEEE Std 802.3.1

Cl **5** *SC* **5.4** *P* **29** *L* **1** # 275

Healey, Adam Broadcom Ltd.

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *bucket*

[PDF page 26]. The use of "wide" pages for wide tables is understandable but use of such pages is inconsistent. The tree heirarchy and modules shown here and on subsequent pages do not seem to warrant the wide pages. This is demonstrated on page 79 (PDF page 76) which uses the normal page orientation. Further complicating matters is that Table 6-1 (page 63, PDF page 60) is not on a wide page and is truncated.

SuggestedRemedy

Use wide pages only for wide tables and "normal" pages elsewhere.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **5** *SC* **5.4** *P* **29** *L* **6** # 283

Brad Booth Microsoft

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **R**

Editorial Note is not required as IEEE 802.3 draft standards and standards are permitted to reference
other draft specifications. Future revisions of 802.3.2 will be permitted to modify the reference once it
moves to stable status.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete the editorial notes in 5.4, 6.5, 7.3 and 8.5.

Response *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.

The current IETF RFC 6087BIS being used is still early on in the process, and once published as draft, it will be given its own RFC number, which we intend to reference, as indicated on the note.

Cl **5** *SC* **5.4.2** *P* **31** *L* **3** # 265

Lapak, Jeff UNH-IOL

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A**

Either the word following is wrong or this sentence points to wrong subclause.

"In the following YANG module definition, should any discrepancy between the DESCRIPTION text and the corresponding definition in 5.2 through 5.3 of this clause occur, the definitions in 5.3 and mappings in 5.3 shall take precedence."

SuggestedRemedy

Change referenced subclauses (5.2 -> 5.3 & 5.3 -> 5.4):

"In the following YANG module definition, should any discrepancy between the DESCRIPTION text and the corresponding definition in 5.3 through 5.4 of this clause occur, the definitions and mappings in 5.4 shall take precedence."

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **5** *SC* **5.4.2** *P* **37** *L* **47** # 328

Remein, Duane Huawei

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A**

Several instances of missing leading single quotes:
in-errors' should be 'in-errors' on pg 51 ln 47
discontinuity-time' should be 'discontinuity-time' on pg 52 ln 28, pg 52 ln 51, pg 53 ln 24, pg 53 ln 52, pg 54 ln 23, pg 54 ln 46, pg 55 ln 17, pg 55 ln 45, and pg 56 ln 45
mpcp-admin-state' should be 'mpcp-admin-state' on pg 100 ln 4
mpcp-maximum-queue-count-per-report' should be 'mpcp-maximum-queue-count-per-report' on pg 126 ln 34 and pg 130 ln 45
mpcp-queue-index' should be 'mpcp-queue-index' on pg 125 ln 23 and pg 129 ln 9
mpcp-queue-set-group' should be 'mpcp-queue-set-group' on pg 130 ln 56
out-multicast-pkts' should be 'out-multicast-pkts' on pg 52 ln 13 and pg 53 ln 44
out-pkts-collision-multiple' should be 'out-pkts-collision-multiple' on pg 53 ln 16 and pg 54 ln 15
out-pkts-collision-single' should be 'out-pkts-collision-single' on pg 54 ln 14
out-unicast-ptks' should be 'out-unicast-ptks' on pg 53 ln 12
trx-power-in-high-threshold-crossing' should be 'trx-power-in-high-threshold-crossing' on pg 116 ln 34
trx-power-in-low-threshold-crossing' should be 'trx-power-in-low-threshold-crossing' on pg 116 ln 7
trx-power-out-high-threshold-crossing' should be 'trx-power-out-high-threshold-crossing' on pg 117 ln 30

SuggestedRemedy

Add all leading single quotes as indicated. Note the problem is stated to make it easier to do a find & replace edit.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **5** SC **5.4.2.1** P **29** L **5** # 288

Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI,

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **A**

"Restructed to be NMDA compliant.";" - there is no such word - can't tell whether this should be "restructured" or "restricted". Occurs multiple times (draft consistently says Restructed)

SuggestedRemedy

Resolve with either one.

Response *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change

"Restructed to be NMDA compliant."

to

"Restructured to be NMDA compliant."

Cl **5** SC **5.4.2.1** P **29** L **35** # 177

Hajduczenia, Charter

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *bucket*

"i.e." needs a comma

SuggestedRemedy

Replace all instances of "i.e. " with "i.e., " - note the specific use of space
Replace all instances of "e.g. " with "e.g., " - note the specific use of space

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **5** SC **5.4.2.1** P **29** L **41** # 321

Cheng, Weiying Coriant

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **R**

Would it be useful to define rpcs to reset those interface stats?

SuggestedRemedy

Add RPCs to reset interface stats

Response *Response Status* **W**

REJECT.

No specific proposal provided.

Cl **5** SC **5.4.2.1** P **29** L **47** # 289

Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI,

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *eth-legacy*

Half duplex operation is defined here for the MAC, but is deprecated in the 'legacy' on page 50 at line 14. when using CSMA/CD. Which is it? What is half-duplex without CSMA/CD? According to RFC 6020, "deprecated" indicates an obsolete definition, but it permits new/continued implementation in order to foster interoperability with older/existing implementations. The definition of CSMA/CD is not obsolete, while repeaters have been deprecated in most places, mixing segments with CSMA/CD have not.

SuggestedRemedy

Move CSMA/CD and associated counters into active ethernet and change status

Response *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #268

I believe the use of "half" value (indicating half duplex) in duplex-type typdef is correct. When "duplex" leaf is set to "half-duplex" value, it is expected that the interface will expose ieee802-ethernet-interface-half-duplex (once renamed per #268) module, with all half-duplex specific parameters and attributes. When "duplex" leaf is set to "full-duplex" value, no instance of ieee802-ethernet-interface-half-duplex module is expected. To clarify this further in the module, insert the following "when" statement to the ieee802-ethernet-interface-half-duplex module

when
"../../eth-if:ethernet/duplex = 'half'";

Cl **5** SC **5.4.2.1** P **31** L **20** # 178

Hajduczenia, Charter

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A** *bucket*

"XXX" denotes a missing reference (likely)

SuggestedRemedy

Reference is needed, not sure what the right value is though

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Changed comment type from E to T.

Remove "XXX, reference the general interface configuration."

Cl **5** *SC* **5.4.2.1** *P* **33** *L* **19** # 304

Cheng, Weiying Coriant

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **A** *bucket*

Typo 'dicard', should be 'discarded'

SuggestedRemedy

change to 'discarded'

Response *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT.

Cl **5** *SC* **5.4.2.1** *P* **33** *L* **24** # 305

Cheng, Weiying Coriant

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A**

Would it be more clear to have ingress/egress in terms of pause frames? ingress means to process received pause frames and egress mean to transmit pause frames

SuggestedRemedy

PAUSE frame based flow control is enabled in the egress direction only. I.e. PAUSE frames may be transmitted, but received PAUSE frames
received are not processed

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Comment type was changed from E to T

Change all instances of "only. I.e. PAUSE" to "only, i.e., PAUSE"
Change all instances of "received on ingress" to "received in the ingress direction"

Change

"PAUSE frame based flow control is enabled in the egress direction only. I.e. PAUSE frames are not transmitted, but PAUSE frames received on ingress are processed to reduce the egress traffic rate.";

to

"PAUSE frame based flow control is enabled in the egress direction only, i.e., PAUSE frames are not transmitted, but PAUSE frames received in the ingress direction are processed to reduce the egress traffic rate.";

Cl **5** *SC* **5.4.2.1** *P* **33** *L* **41** # 306

Cheng, Weiying Coriant

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **A** *bucket*

Typo, two 'PAUSE frame base' here before 'flow control setting'

SuggestedRemedy

Remove one of them

Response *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT.

Cl **5** *SC* **5.4.2.1** *P* **33** *L* **57** # 338

Trowbridge, Steve Nokia

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A**

The YANG model for Ethernet augments the generic interface model as defined in RFC 7223 (the NMDA version to be more precise). This automatically implies that the list of statistics defined in this RFC as generic for all interfaces are also defined as optional YANG data nodes for Ethernet interfaces. However, from the generic definition it is not clear how to apply them to Ethernet interfaces.

SuggestedRemedy

Define the relationship with the interface YANG model in this document. I.e. define which of the generic IETF defined attributes are relevant to Ethernet interfaces and if relevant make a precise definition in the context of Ethernet interfaces. E.g. define whether the interfaces/interface/statistics/in-errors counter is relevant, and if relevant, which errors it shall count.
Do the same for all leafs: i.e. specify the applicablity and their usage/meaning.
An extra section in annex 5A?

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Insert a new paragraph under 5.2, after the existing paragraph:

"The following attributes from base ietf-interfaces YANG module are supported: name, description, type, enabled, admin-status, if-index, and phys-address. Other attributes are not supported. "

Cl **5** *SC* **5.4.2.1** *P* **34** *L* **19** # 307

Cheng, Weiying Coriant

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **A**

What XXX mean?

SuggestedRemedy

Replace XXX with specific parameters or remove them if not.

Response *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Remove "XXX, reference the general interface configuration."

Cl **5** *SC* **5.4.2.1** *P* **34** *L* **47** # 339

Trowbridge, Steve Nokia

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A** *r/w properties*

The model defines some RW attributes.
For auto-negotiation enable it is clarified in the leaf description that the default status depends on the interface type. Hence the understanding: no default is specified in YANG syntax as this would force this default to all interfaces.

Note that an optional object that does not have a YANG defined default value does 'not exist' when not configured. This is a different situation compared with the object having one of its values.
With other words: for this leaf there are 3 possible situations in configuration datastores: 1) the leaf has value true, 2) has value false, 3) the leaf does not exist.

What situations exist in the operational datastore? Understanding: for interfaces that support auto-negotiation the leaf always exist with a value, i.e. only situation 1 or 2 exist. It is not clear from the description what has to be done for interfaces that do not support auto-negotiation. Create it with value 'false'?
Note, in case 2 and 3 the leaf negotiation-status will also not exist because of the when condition states it only exists in condition 1.

SuggestedRemedy

Assure the device behaviour is always well defined: not only for the case where data is configured, but also for the case the data is not configured.

If not possible to define a default in YANG syntax, then specify the device behavior in the description field for all 3 cases, including for what shall be the content of the operational datastore.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Make sure all attributes that have R/W property and have default value defined in Clause 30 attributes and/or IEEE Std 802.3.1, have also default value/state defined in 802.3.2. Where default value is not present, insert the following text into description "The default value is implementation-dependent."

As a general observation, the fact that an leaf is writeable, gives the remote management station ability to change the setting.

Cl **5** *SC* **5.4.2.1** *P* **34** *L* **50** # 179

Hajduczenia, Charter

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A** *todo-container-statistics*

"TODO" in description field

SuggestedRemedy

Use the following text for statistics container: "This container collects all statistics for IEEE Std 802.3 Ethernet interfaces."

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Comment type was changed from E to T

Cl **5** *SC* **5.4.2.1** *P* **35** *L* **41** # 340

Trowbridge, Steve Nokia

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A** *r/w properties*

The model defines some RW attributes.
For the leaf duplex there is a default defined as part of the type definition. Hence the object will always have a value in the configuration datastore?
What is the device supposed to write in the operational datastore when no information is available, e.g. the link is down ?

SuggestedRemedy

Assure the device behaviour is always well defined, either through YANG syntax definition or via the description field.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #339

Also, add a value "unknown" to the type duplex-type, which is used when the link is disconnected / initializing.

Cl **5** *SC* **5.4.2.1** *P* **35** *L* **46** # 180

Hajduczenia, Charter

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *bucket*

We avoid contractions in the text of the standard

SuggestedRemedy

Replace all "doesn't" and "don't" with full expansion everywhere in the document

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **5** *SC* **5.4.2.1** *P* **35** *L* **50** # 341

Trowbridge, Steve Nokia

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A** *r/w properties*

The model defines some RW attributes.
For the leaf speed there is no default. What is the device supposed to do if no speed is configured?
What is the device supposed to do when the speed is configured but the configured speed is not supported by the underlying hardware?
What is the device supposed to write in the operational datastore when no information is available, e.g. the link is down ?

SuggestedRemedy

Assure the device behaviour is always well defined, either through YANG syntax definition or via the description field: not only for the case where data is configured, but also for the case the data is not configured.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #339

The speed setting for interfaces that initialize / are disconnected is implementation-dependent.

Cl **5** *SC* **5.4.2.1** *P* **36** *L* **11** # 342

Trowbridge, Steve Nokia

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A** *r/w properties*

The model defines some RW attributes.
For the flow-control pause direction it is decribed the default is vendor specific.
What is the meaning of 'a vendor specific default'? I.e. I can understand there is vendor specific behavior when the object is not configured (= does not exist), but then the object still does not exist in the configuration datastores, i.e. it has no default value.
Is it the intention to say that if nothing is configured, then the operational datastore shall contain a value defined by the vendor?
What is the device supposed to write in the operational datastore when no information is available, e.g. the link is down ?

SuggestedRemedy

Assure the device behaviour is always well defined, either through YANG syntax definition or via the description field: not only for the case where data is configured, but also for the case the data is not configured.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #339

Also, add a value "undefined" to the type pause-fc-direction-type, which is used when the link is disconnected / initilizing.

Cl **5** *SC* **5.4.2.1** *P* **36** *L* **14** # 231

Anslow, Pete Ciena

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *bucket*

pdf page 36
printed page 39
"IEEE Std 802.3, 30.3.1.1.25 aMaxFrameLength", but aMaxFrameLength is 30.3.1.1.37

SuggestedRemedy

Change 30.3.1.1.25 to 30.3.1.1.37

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **5** *SC* **5.4.2.1** *P* **37** *L* **24** # 343

Trowbridge, Steve Nokia

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A** *r/w properties*

The model defines some RW attributes.
For pfc enable it is described that it is by default enabled when auto-negotiation is enabled.
It is not described what happens when auto-negotation is not enabled / the object does not exist.
If the object is not configured, does the object always exist in the operational datastore with a vendor selected default?

SuggestedRemedy

Assure the device behaviour is always well defined, either through YANG syntax definition or via the description field: not only for the case where data is configured, but also for the case the data is not configured.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #339

The PFC setting for interfaces that initialize / are disconnected is implementation-dependent.

Cl **5** *SC* **5.4.2.1** *P* **37** *L* **50** # 308

Cheng, Weiying Coriant

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **A** *todo-container-statistics*

Does 'TODO' mean this is not completed?

SuggestedRemedy

Complete the description for the review

Response *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #179

Cl **5** *SC* **5.4.2.1** *P* **38** *L* **17** # 181
Hajduczenia, Charter

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A**
aFrameTooShortErrors is not defined anywhere

SuggestedRemedy
Please provide definition for aFrameTooShortErrors

Response *Response Status* **C**
ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Delete "+ aFrameTooShortErrors" on page 24, "<aFrameTooShortErrors> +" and the review note in lines 25/26 on page 38.

Cl **5** *SC* **5.4.2.1** *P* **38** *L* **50** # 182
Hajduczenia, Charter

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A**
in-total-octets is defined as a leaf, but no reference to 802.3 / 802.3.1 definitions

SuggestedRemedy
Please provide definition for in-total-octets

Response *Response Status* **C**
ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Strike "// REVIEW NOTE - There does not appear to be any clause
// 30 register defined for this counter."

Update

"(RMON MIB: etherStatsOctets) IEEE Std 802.3, TBD";

to

"RFC 2819, etherStatsOctets";

Cl **5** *SC* **5.4.2.1** *P* **39** *L* **18** # 309
Cheng, Weiying Coriant

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A** *bucket*
macc' is a little confusing, suggest to say 'mac-control'

SuggestedRemedy
replace 'macc' with 'mac-control'

Response *Response Status* **C**
ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Changed comment type from E to T.

Replace all instances of "macc" with "mac-control"

Cl **5** *SC* **5.4.2.1** *P* **40** *L* **22** # 183
Hajduczenia, Charter

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *bucket*
Remove text in lines 22-31

SuggestedRemedy

Response *Response Status* **C**
ACCEPT.

Cl **5** *SC* **5.4.2.1** *P* **41** *L* **1** # 184
Hajduczenia, Charter

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A**
in-error-undersize-pkts defined as a leaf, but no reference to 802.3 / 802.3.1 definitions

SuggestedRemedy
Please provide definition for in-error-undersize-pkts

Response *Response Status* **C**
ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Use the following reference

"RFC 2819, etherStatsUndersizePkts and
etherStatsFragments"

Strike "// REVIEW NOTE - This reference does not appear to be
// correct, is a new clause 30 register
// definition required?"

Cl **5** *SC* **5.4.2.1** *P* **41** *L* **25** # 255

Yseboodt, Lennart Philips Lighting

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A**

There are a number of "// REVIEW NOTE" in the reproduced Yang models. The first occurance is on page 41, line 25.

For a working group ballot review these should all be resolved.

SuggestedRemedy

Fix the following "REVIEW NOTES":
page 41 line 25 and 50
page 43 line 23
page 44 line 3, line 39, line 47
page 46 line 5

Response *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Remove all REVIEW NOTE sections with associated text

Cl **5** *SC* **5.4.2.1** *P* **47** *L* **6** # 232

Anslow, Pete Ciena

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *bucket*

pdf page 47
printed page 50
"aTransmitPIMicroseconds" should be "aTransmitLPIMicroseconds" (L missing)

SuggestedRemedy

Change "aTransmitPIMicroseconds" to "aTransmitLPIMicroseconds"

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **5** *SC* **5.4.2.2** *P* **49** *L* **15** # 290

Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI,

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *eth-legacy*

feature CSMA/CD (listed as deprecated half duplex) is not found as a separate managed feature of IEEE Std 802.3 - hence it's reference is IEEE Std 802.3, TBD.

SuggestedRemedy

Move CSMA-CD feature and associated counters into active ethernet and change status. All of the element features are MAC entity attributes under 30.3.1.1

Response *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #268

Cl **5** *SC* **5.4.2.2** *P* **51** *L* **46** # 185

Hajduczenia, Charter

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A** *bucket*

I do not believe this augmentation is needed

SuggestedRemedy

Strike page 51 ,line 47 onwrds to page 52, line 3

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **5** *SC* **5.4.2.2** *P* **53** *L* **12** # 291

Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI,

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *bucket*

Typo: should t-ptks be -pkts? Occurs 4 times (same page, lines 12, 16, 43, 45).

SuggestedRemedy

change ptks to pkts globally

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **5A** *SC* *P* **175** *L* **13** # 243
Marris, Arthur Cadence Design Syste

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *annex-5a*

This is just a place holder with no content

SuggestedRemedy

Add suitable content to Annwx 5A

Response *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #276

Cl **5A** *SC* **5A** *P* *L* # 230
Anslow, Pete Ciena

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A** *annex-5a*

Annex 5A is incomplete

SuggestedRemedy

Add suitable text for Annex 5A

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #276

Cl **5A** *SC* **5A** *P* **174** *L* **1** # 358
Trowbridge, Steve Nokia

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *annex-5a*

This Annex is virtually empty with the intro saying <some text> and the reference to 802.3 indiciating that certain managed objects are to be added, which is not even flagged with an editor's note.

SuggestedRemedy

Fill in or remove the Annex

Response *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #276

Cl **5A** *SC* **5A** *P* **175** *L* **1** # 314
Cheng, Weiying Coriant

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **A** *annex-5a*

This Annex is incomplete and does not provide much information. Also where is Annex 1 to 4? Remove this Annxex

SuggestedRemedy

Either remove Annex 5A or change it to Annex 1 and clean them up.

Response *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #276

Cl **5A** *SC* **5A.1** *P* **174** *L* **14** # 214
Slavick, Jeff Broadcom Ltd

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *annex-5a*

<some text> is not very descriptive of what this annex is providing

SuggestedRemedy

Add an appropriate introduction to what will provided in this annex.

Response *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #276

Cl **5A** *SC* **5A.1** *P* **175** *L* **13** # 260
Yseboodt, Lennart Philips Lighting

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **A** *annex-5a*

"5A.1 Introduction
<some text>"

What is the point of this Annex ?

SuggestedRemedy

Either complete the contents; or remove the Annex 5A.

Response *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #276

Cl **5A** *SC* **5A.1** *P* **175** *L* **14** # 225
Graber, Steffen Pepperl+Fuchs GmbH

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *annex-5a*

< some text> (remove this marker)

SuggestedRemedy

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #276

Cl **6** *SC* **6** *P* **61** *L* **1** # 256
Yseboodt, Lennart Philips Lighting

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **R**

The definition of the YANG models should be updated to match with the additional Clause 30 objects created by P802.3bt.

SuggestedRemedy

Per comment.

Response *Response Status* **W**

REJECT.

P802.3bt is outside of the scope for this project: IEEE Std 802.3bw-2015, IEEE Std 802.3by-2016, IEEE Std 802.3bq-2016, IEEE Std 802.3bp-2016, IEEE Std 802.3br-2016, IEEE Std 802.3bn-2016, IEEE Std 802.3bz-2016, IEEE Std 802.3bu-2016, IEEE Std 802.3bv-2017 IEEE Std 802.3bs-2017, IEEE Std 802.3cc-2017, and IEEE Std 802.3-2015/Cor 1-2017 merged into 802.3-2015 is the scope of this project.

Cl **6** *SC* **6.1** *P* **61** *L* **12** # 240
Marris, Arthur Cadence Design Syste

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A** *bucket*

It would read better if "will allow for" is changed to "allow"

SuggestedRemedy

Change "will allow for" to "allow"

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **6** *SC* **6.3** *P* **59** *L* **1** # 355
Trowbridge, Steve Nokia

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **A** *bucket*

The page containing the 2nd part of Table 6-1 is cut off at the edges

SuggestedRemedy

Make the page containing the 2nd part of Table 6-1 landscape. Likely clause 6.4 should start on the next portrait page

Response *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT.

Cl **6** *SC* **6.3** *P* **59** *L* **14** # 299
Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI,

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *poe-module*

The "PoE Port" type implies a new type of IEEE 802.3 device - one that configurably does both clause 33 and clause 104. THere is no such reference or way of controlling this in IEEE Std 802.3, and it is against the current management structure. While this is a read-only attribute, it implies a multi-clause device between 104 and either 33 or 145, which creates a number of interoperabiltiy and compatibility problems, including, for example, need for additional controls (which pair of the 4 pairs is used?) there are numerous comments on this, (PoDLvsPoE)

SuggestedRemedy

Delete pse-pair-mode and separate PoDL managment tree to a different module from PoE management trees. Delete leaf-pse-pair-mode and restructure. If structure is kept, suggest using supported-clause (33, 104 or 145) as the branch differentiator.

Response *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #296.

Cl **6** *SC* **6.3** *P* **59** *L* **16** # 292
Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI,

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A**

pse-enable should be Read-only if it corresponds to aPSEAdminState (note - clause 30 has a different attribute which writes this - acPSEAdminControl)

SuggestedRemedy

Either Change to R/W to R or add acPSEAdminControl to the Clause 30 attribute

Response *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change R/W for pse-enable to R

Cl **6** *SC* **6.3** *P* **60** *L* **1** # 186

Hajduczenia, Charter

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *page-60, bucket*

Page orientation is messed up on Table 6-1

SuggestedRemedy

Plase make sure page oriantation matched table alignment.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

See comment #198

Cl **6** *SC* **6.3** *P* **60** *L* **1** # 198

McDermott, Thomas retired

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **A** *page-60, bucket*

Page 60 of the pdf file (marked page 63 in the document footer) appears to be mis-formatted with the table running out of the readable area of the document and is thus not readable.

SuggestedRemedy

Reformat page 60 of the pdf file (marked as page 63 in the footer).

Response *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT.

Cl **6** *SC* **6.3** *P* **60** *L* **3** # 213

Slavick, Jeff Broadcom Ltd

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *page-60, bucket*

Table 6-1 spans over two pages and the 2nd page isn't landscape

SuggestedRemedy

Change the tables throughout the document to be sized for portrait layout and make all pages portrait orientation.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

See comment #198

Cl **6** *SC* **6.3** *P* **60** *L* **10** # 293

Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI,

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A**

pse-enable should be Read-only if it corresponds to aPoDLPSEAdminState (note - clause 30 has a different attribute which writes this - acPoDLPSEAdminControl)

SuggestedRemedy

Either Change to R/W to R or add acPoDLPSEAdminControl to the Clause 30 attribute

Response *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change R/W for pse-enable to R

Cl **6** *SC* **6.3** *P* **63** *L* **1** # 278

Stover, David Analog Devices

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **A** *page-60, bucket*

Table 6–1 is too wide to fit on page 63.

SuggestedRemedy

Fix formatting of Table 6–1 to fit on page.

Response *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT.

See comment #198.

Cl **6** *SC* **6.3** *P* **63** *L* **1** # 203

Hidaka, Yasuo Independent

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *page-60, bucket*

Table 6-1 does not fit in page 63.

SuggestedRemedy

Use a whole page and rotate the table in the same way as page 62.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

See comment #198

Cl **6** *SC* **6.3** *P* **63** *L* **6** # 257

Yseboodt, Lennart Philips Lighting

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **A** *page-60, bucket*

Table 6-1 is far too wide for the page.

SuggestedRemedy

Reduce width of Table to fit page.
In line with earlier comment, do not turn into a landscape page but rather change the width of the Container(s) column to make it work.

Response *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #198

Cl **6** *SC* **6.4** *P* **63** *L* **37** # 264

Lapak, Jeff UNH-IOL

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *bucket*

Clause numbering scheme is inconsistent with Clause 5. This subcluase 6.4 sits between CL30 mapping and the YANG model.

SuggestedRemedy

Move this subclause ahead of the CL 30 mapping. I.E. Rename CL6.4 -> 6.3 and 6.3 -> 6.4.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **6** *SC* **6.4** *P* **63** *L* **58** # 218

Graber, Steffen Pepperl+Fuchs GmbH

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *bucket*

Some of the readable operational state in this module … (states should be plural)

SuggestedRemedy

Some of the readable operational states in this module …

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **6** *SC* **6.4** *P* **64** *L* **1** # 279

Stover, David Analog Devices

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *bucket*

Section 6.4 is split across pages with different orientations. Specifically, the last few lines of 6.4 are on a landscape page for no reason.

SuggestedRemedy

If possible, ensure page orientation for 6.4 is consistent.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **6** *SC* **6.4** *P* **64** *L* **1** # 258

Yseboodt, Lennart Philips Lighting

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **A** *bucket*

Page is landscape without need.

SuggestedRemedy

Make page portrait orientation.

Response *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT.

Cl **6** *SC* **6.5.1** *P* **62** *L* **14** # 300

Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI,

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A**

PoDL is not a 'pair mode' of a normal PSE, it is a different clause (PoDLvsPoE) - tree needs re-structuring at its root (PoDLvsPoE)

SuggestedRemedy

Delete pse-pair-mode and create a separate module for PoDL from PoE, taking the "single-pair" branch into its own module, and Editor to separate containers for poe-pse and podl-pse in 6.5.2, replicating necessary definitions, as necessary. If kept, change the name from pse-pair-mode to pse-clause-supported with values 33, 104 and 145 - including structure for 802.3bt devices

Response *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #296.

Cl **6** SC **6.5.2** P **67** L **1** # 259
Yseboodt, Lennart Philips Lighting

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **A** *bucket*

There is no need to use landscape page orientation for these Yang models.

SuggestedRemedy

Reduce font size such that the text fits on a portrait page without excessive line wrapping.

Response *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Portrait mode will be attempted and used only if the module text fits without overflow.

Cl **6** SC **6.5.2** P **67** L **18** # 234
Anslow, Pete Ciena

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *bucket*

pdf page 67
printed page 70
"IEEE Std 802.3, 30.15.1.3", but 30.15.1.3 does not exist

SuggestedRemedy

Change "30.15.1.3" to "30.15.1.1.3"

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **6** SC **6.5.2** P **67** L **22** # 294
Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI,

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A**

The enumerated power classes reflect 802.3 bt - I thought the scope of this was only 802.3-2015. which is it? also, if 802.3bt is included, it is not fully included (a quick check shows that the "A" and "B" classifications and counters added by 802.3bt are missing - likely other bt-unique additions, like accomodations for "dual-signature" PDs are missing (tag: 802.3bt status)

SuggestedRemedy

Either - scrub the rest of the draft to show and make sure that 802.3bt is fully included and mark classes 5 through 8 as "802.3bt or PoDL-only", or separate out classes 5 through 8 as PoDL-only as well.

Response *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The scope is 802.3-2018, with all amendments included. 802.3bt is NOT included. Module will be scrubbed to remove any .3bt material.

Cl **6** SC **6.5.2** P **68** L **20** # 295
Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI,

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A**

The reference only refers to aPSEPowerClassification, but the enumerations also include aPoDLPSEPowerClasssification (effected but not part of the PoDLvsPoE comments)

SuggestedRemedy

Include aPoDLPSEPowerClassification in the references

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Comment type changed from E to T

add IEEE Std 802.3, 30.15.1.1.6 aPoDLPSEDetectedPDPowerClass to reference for this leaf

---

Cl **6** SC **6.5.2** P **68** L **39** # 187
Hajduczenia, Charter

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *bucket*

Plenty of commnets (indicated with *) in this module

SuggestedRemedy

Remove all text withing /* */ blocks

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **6** SC **6.5.2** P **69** L **35** # 297
Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI,

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A**

PoDL is not a 'pair mode' of a normal PSE, it is a different clause (PoDLvsPoE)

SuggestedRemedy

If main comment to separate clause 104 and clause 33 managment is accepted, this identity moves to a separate managment element, otherwise, find a new word to make it clear that this is more than a mode. (suggest "power-clause-supported", with identities 33, 104 and 145 might makes sense)

Response *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #296.

Cl **6** *SC* **6.5.2** *P* **69** *L* **35** # 281

Stover, David Analog Devices

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *bucket*

Misspelled word

SuggestedRemedy

Change "unkown" to "unknown".

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **6** *SC* **6.5.2** *P* **69** *L* **44** # 296

Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI,

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *poe-module*

The "PoE Port" type implies a new type of IEEE 802.3 device - one that configurably does both clause 33 and clause 104. THere is no such reference or way of controlling this in IEEE Std 802.3, and it is against the current management structure. While this is a read-only attribute, it implies a multi-clause device between 104 and either 33 or 145, which creates a number of interoperabiltiy and compatibility problems, including, for example, need for additional controls (which pair of the 4 pairs is used?) there are numerous comments on this, tagged PoDLvsPoE, but I don't think I've found all the cases.

SuggestedRemedy

Separate single-pair (Clause 104) and multi-pair (Clause 33, and, if 802.3bt is included Clause 145) PSE management into a different module structure breaking off PoDL branch and eliminating pse-pair-mode so that single-pair and multi-pair are separate at the module level (PoE port and PoDLPoEport instead of just PoE port).

Response *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Update PoE YANG module per 802d3cf_0318_yan_1a.yang. Update PoE YANG tree per 802d3cf_0318_yan_2a.tree.

Cl **6** *SC* **6.5.2** *P* **69** *L* **48** # 188

Hajduczenia, Charter

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A** *.3bt*

There are multiple references to ".3bt" devices - these need to be referenced in a different name or just by clause number instead

SuggestedRemedy

per comment - better name is needed

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Changed comment type from E to T

Remove all .3bt material from the draft - it is outside of the scope of this project

Cl **6** *SC* **6.5.2** *P* **69** *L* **48** # 301

Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI,

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *.3bt*

4-pair powering calls out .bt devices. These are 802.3bt devices, and also, I thought they were out of scope, since scope was just 802.3-2015? (802.3bt status)

SuggestedRemedy

Determine whether 802.3bt is in scope, and, if so, make sure it is fully implemented. If not, delete it (saving the work for the future).

Response *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Remove all .3bt material from the draft - it is outside of the scope of this project

Cl **6** *SC* **6.5.2** *P* **70** *L* **8** # 298

Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI,

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A**

leaf-pse-pair-mode. Single-pair is not a valid value for this parameter, which is listed in table 5-1 only for PoE (clause 33 devices) - (PoDLvsPoE)

SuggestedRemedy

Change description on line 8 - PoE PSEs may use

Response *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #296.

Cl **6** *SC* **6.5.2** *P* **71** *L* **42** # 189
Hajduczenia, Charter

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *bucket*

"when the PSE state diagram enters the state ERROR_DELAY_SHORT." - since we are not within 802.3 document anymore, an explicit reference to what figure it is is needed

SuggestedRemedy

Provide reference to the said state diagram in "IEEE Std 802.3, Figure XXXXX" format

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Use IEEE Std 802.3, Figure 33-9 for reference

Cl **6** *SC* **6.5.2** *P* **72** *L* **41** # 190
Hajduczenia, Charter

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *bucket*

"Pse" or "PSE" or "pse"?

SuggestedRemedy

Pick one, use consistently in the whole document

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Use "PSE" consistently

Cl **6** *SC* **6.5.2** *P* **74** *L* **37** # 235
Anslow, Pete Ciena

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *bucket*

pdf page 74
printed page 77
"IEEE Std 802.3, 30.9.1.1.6 aPSEPowerClassfication", but 30.9.1.1.6 is "aPoDLPSEDetectedPDPowerClass"

SuggestedRemedy

Change "aPSEPowerClassfication", to "aPoDLPSEDetectedPDPowerClass"

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **6** *SC* **6.5.2** *P* **75** *L* **1** # 322
Remein, Duane Huawei

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *bucket*

Seems like an odd place for a page-turn

SuggestedRemedy

Scrub the document for extraneous/out of place page turns and remove or move to a more appropriate location.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **6** *SC* **6.5.2** *P* **76** *L* **1** # 191
Hajduczenia, Charter

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *bucket*

Page oriantation should be horizontal

SuggestedRemedy

Per comment

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **6** *SC* **6.5.2** *P* **76** *L* **35** # 280
Stover, David Analog Devices

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *bucket*

Consistent capitalization of proper nouns and acronyms should be used where appropriate. In this case, "Type" is a proper noun.

SuggestedRemedy

Fix "type" as "Type" here. In all text comments throughout, ensure proper capitalization of Type and PSE.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **6** *SC* **6.5.2** *P* **77** *L* **31** # 282

Stover, David Analog Devices

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A**

type power-class does not reflect all enumerations in aPoDLPSEDetectedPDPowerClass. Specifically, "unknown" is missing.

Additionally, power-class does not list Class 5 through Class 8 as "PoDL only". In defining muti-pair "classifications" data node, Table 61 references existing Clause 30 aPSEPowerClassification attribute (only Class 0 through Class 4 defined in this attribute).

SuggestedRemedy

Add "unknown" enumeration to power-class.

Consider renaming power-class as podl-power-class and determining which classes to support for multi-pair "classifications" data node.

Response *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Add "unknown" enumeration to power-class. Define class 5-8 for podl-only.

See comment #296.

Cl **7** *SC* **7** *P* **78** *L* # 263

B, A C

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A** *10g-epon*

Is there a reason why 10G EPON is not also included? For example, the FEC in 10G EPON is inserted in a different manner than is shown in Figure 7-5 for EPON.

SuggestedRemedy

Either include 10G EPON or state that it is not included and the reason for not including it.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #332

Cl **7** *SC* **7** *P* **79** *L* **1** # 219

Graber, Steffen Pepperl+Fuchs GmbH

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *bucket*

Page numbers 79 and 80 are present two times.

SuggestedRemedy

Correct page numbering.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **7** *SC* **7.1** *P* **79** *L* **1** # 199

McDermott, Thomas retired

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **A** *bucket*

The page number in the footer goes from 80 to 79 to 80 to 81. Thus there are two pages marked 79 in the footer and two pages marked 80 in the footer.

SuggestedRemedy

Re do the page numbers throughout the document.

Response *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT.

Cl **7** *SC* **7.2.1** *P* **78** *L* **17** # 356

Trowbridge, Steve Nokia

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **R**

Most of this clause, pages 78 through 86, restates, sometimes in a different format, aspects of the configuration, layer stack, frame format, FEC, etc. that are included in 802.3. Going to this much detail creates a risk of inconsistency between 802.3.2 and 802.3, and can create document maintenance issues when there is evolution of 802.3.

SuggestedRemedy

At a minimum, clarify that 802.3 takes precedence in the case of inconsistency. But preferably, make this clause much shorter and deal with the EPON architecture and details far more through references to 802.3 rather than text in this document.

Response *Response Status* **W**

REJECT.

Most of the text was taken verbatim from IEEE Std 802.3.1. Furthermore, EPON in 802.3 is covered in 8-9 clauses, that have been extracted to something that a person not skilled in 802.3 language can understand and match to the YANG module definition.

Cl **7** *SC* **7.2.1.1** *P* **78** *L* **21** # 354

Trowbridge, Steve Nokia

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **A**

It isn't exactly "breaking news" that the EPON standard is "now" part of 802.3 given that it was first developed as part of 802.3 and P802.3ah completed in 2014.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete the first sentence of the paragraph. Another sentence could be added later in the paragraph to specify that "EPON Physical Layer and Media Access Control sublayers are specified in IEEE Std 802.3 clauses 56, 57, 58, …"

Response *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change

The EPON standard, now part of IEEE Std 802.3, defines the Physical Layer and Media Access Control sublayer of EPON interfaces. EPON is a variant of Gigabit Ethernet used in optical access.

To

EPON is defined in IEEE Std 802.3, covering Physical Layer and Media Access Control sublayer of 1G-EPON and 10G-EPON interfaces.

Cl **7** *SC* **7.2.1.1** *P* **78** *L* **25** # 331

Powell, Bill Nokia

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A**

This paragraph indicates that the OLT is in the central office. Many suppliers and operators are now deploying remote OLTs at optical nodes, closer to subscribers.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the OLT in Central Office sentence to read:
"Individual branches of the PON are terminated
with the Optical Line Terminal (OLT) in the Central Office or at remote optical nodes, and Optical Network Units (ONUs) near
the subscribers.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Comment type changed from E to T

Change

Individual branches of the PON are terminated with the Optical Line Terminal (OLT) in the Central Office and Optical Network Units (ONUs) near the subscribers.

To

Individual branches of the PON are terminated with the Optical Line Terminal (OLT) in the Central Office or at remote optical nodes, and Optical Network Units (ONUs) near the subscribers.

Cl **7** *SC* **7.2.1.2** *P* **80** *L* **13** # 220

Graber, Steffen Pepperl+Fuchs GmbH

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *bucket*

… and it is connected to media dependent interface … (add 'a' after 'to')

SuggestedRemedy

… and it is connected to a media dependent interface ...

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **7** *SC* **7.2.1.3** *P* **81** *L* **21** # 261

B, A C

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **A** *bucket*

missing article

SuggestedRemedy

change "to upstream" to "to the upstream"

Response *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT.

Cl **7** *SC* **7.2.1.3** *P* **81** *L* **21** # 221

Graber, Steffen Pepperl+Fuchs GmbH

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *bucket*

Access to upstream channel .. (add 'the' after 'to')

SuggestedRemedy

Access to the upstream channel ...

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

See comment #261

Cl **7** *SC* **7.2.1.6** *P* **82** *L* **55** # 262

B, A C

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **A** *bucket*

missing article

SuggestedRemedy

change "provides mechanism" to "provides a mechanism"

Response *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT.

Cl **7** *SC* **7.2.1.6** *P* **83** *L* **3** # 222

Graber, Steffen Pepperl+Fuchs GmbH

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *bucket*

… slave devices to master device clock. (add 'the' after 'to')

SuggestedRemedy

… slave devices to the master device clock.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **7** *SC* **7.2.1.6** *P* **83** *L* **6** # 223

Graber, Steffen Pepperl+Fuchs GmbH

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *bucket*

… does not overlap. (replace 'does' by 'do')

SuggestedRemedy

… do not overlap.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **7** *SC* **7.2.1.7** *P* **84** *L* **1** # 332

Powell, Bill Nokia

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A** *10g-epon*

This section says that use of FEC is optional for EPON. This is only true for 1G EPON and not 10G EPON, where it is mandatory.

SuggestedRemedy

Clarify that FEC is only optional for 1G EPON (upstream or downstream) and is mandatory for 10G EPON (upstream or downstream). A possible change to the first sentence of this paragraph is:
"The optional FEC mechanism is optional for 1G EPON but is mandatory for 10G EPON, and is defined to enhance the EPON link budget"
There may be additional places where corrections like this are needed.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Change

The optional FEC mechanism is defined to enhance the EPON link budget.

To

The FEC mechanism is optional for 1G-EPON but is mandatory for 10G-EPON, and is defined to enhance the EPON link budget.

Cl **7** *SC* **7.2.2** *P* **85** *L* **61** # 224

Graber, Steffen Pepperl+Fuchs GmbH

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *bucket*

Each row in the tables are indexed … (replace 'are' by 'is')

SuggestedRemedy

Each row in the tables is indexed ...

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **7** *SC* **7.3.2** *P* **89** *L* **3** # 267

Lapak, Jeff UNH-IOL

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A**

Either the word following is wrong or this sentence has no effect.

"In the following YANG module definition, should any discrepancy between the DESCRIPTION text and the corresponding definition in 7.2 through 7.3 of this clause occur, the definitions in 7.2 through 7.3 shall take precedence."

SuggestedRemedy

Change sentence to the following (mostly copied from clause 5.4.2 for consistency)

"In the following YANG module definition, should any discrepancy between the DESCRIPTION text and the corresponding definition in 7.2 through 7.3 of this clause occur, the definitions and mappings in 7.3 shall take precedence."

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **7** *SC* **7.3.2** *P* **89** *L* **32** # 327

Remein, Duane Huawei

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A**

Overly verbose description with excessive detail (all correct but willit really help the craft?).

SuggestedRemedy

Replace with:
Logical Link Identifiers (LLIDs) are used to identiy a single MAC from a number of MACs which may be present in the EPON OLT or ONU. LLIDs between the value of 0x07FFE and 0x7FFF are reserved for ONU discovery and registration. Other LLIDs are dynamically assigned by the OLT during the registration process. For a complete description of how the LLID is used in an EPON device see IEEE Std 802.3 subclause 65.1.3.3 for 1G-EPON or 76.2.6.1.3 for 10G-EPON.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Comment type was changed from E to T

Use the following description

Logical Link Identifiers (LLIDs) are used to identiy a single MAC from a number of MACs which may be present in the EPON OLT or ONU. LLIDs between the value of 0x07FFE and 0x7FFF are reserved for ONU discovery and registration. Other LLIDs are dynamically assigned by the OLT during the registration process. For a complete description of how the LLID is used in an EPON device; see IEEE Std 802.3, 65.1.3.3 for 1G-EPON and 76.2.6.1.3 for 10G-EPON.

Cl **7** *SC* **7.3.2** *P* **95** *L* **52** # 323

Remein, Duane Huawei

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *bucket*

Seems like most multi-line descriptions except this one start on a new line.
Same issue pg 96 ln 1

SuggestedRemedy

Begin the description proper (i.e., "FEC mode: …" on a new line

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **7** *SC* **7.3.2** *P* **96** *L* **48** # 324

Remein, Duane Huawei

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *bucket*

Indenting is inconsistent with the rest of the document.

SuggestedRemedy

Indent entire description as elsewhere in document.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **7** *SC* **7.3.2** *P* **133** *L* **32** # 325

Remein, Duane Huawei

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *bucket*

Same issue pg 134 line 13

SuggestedRemedy

Move the quote markes to beginning of description text (i.e., to read "This object …) and indent the description as is typical in the doc. Ensure individiual lines are not excessively long (~60 characters excluding indent)

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **8** *SC* **8.1** *P* **142** *L* **7** # 357

Trowbridge, Steve Nokia

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *802-3-ah*

There is no need to talk about historical task forces that added clauses to 802.3 - 802.3ah completed in 2004 and has been included in the full standard since the IEEE Std 802.3-2005 revision.

SuggestedRemedy

Refer to IEEE Std 802.3 clause 57 rather than the OAM functions added by 802.3ah

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #248

Cl **8** *SC* **8.1** *P* **143** *L* **7** # 248

Winkel, Ludwig Siemens AG

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A** *802-3-ah*

Don't mension a committee that did something. Discribe it more neutral.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to: "The Amendment IEEE 802.3ah with the title Ethernet in the First Mile (EFM) contains management capabilities to .."

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change to: "IEEE Std 802.3, Clause 57 added management capabilities to .."

Cl **8** *SC* **8.4** *P* **146** *L* **14** # 310

Cheng, Weiying Coriant

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A**

Why operational-status is W/R, should it be RO? RFC4878 also has it RO

SuggestedRemedy

Replace W/R with RO

Response *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change R/W to R

Cl **8** *SC* **8.5.1** *P* **150** *L* **18** # 311

Cheng, Weiying Coriant

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A**

unit32 is used for the type of statstics, is any reason why not use yang:count64 that is used in eth-if? Also unit32 may be too smaller to hold stats because it will running a long time

SuggestedRemedy

Use 'yang:count64'

Response *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Make the change globally (all modules)

Cl **8** *SC* **8.5.2** *P* **152** *L* **62** # 367

Trowbridge, Steve Nokia

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A**

Module dependency: in order to reuse the model on other interfaces transporting ethernet frames, there shall be no dependency from this model to the ethernet model. I.e. no import of ieee802-ethernet-interface. In case there is any dependency needed, then this shall be split into a separate module.

SuggestedRemedy

The above proposal (on page 170, line 28) removes the dependency.

Response *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #366

Cl **8** *SC* **8.5.2** *P* **153** *L* **44** # 344

Trowbridge, Steve Nokia

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A**

The description says the device supports remote loopback. From the description it is not clear whether this means support for initiating a loopback request to the peer side, or support acting as a slave on requests initiated from the peer side, or both.
Assumption (from the references): it means support for both.

SuggestedRemedy

Split into 2 features to allow announcing the support for both procedures separately.
Make it clear in the description what it is about.
And apply the definition for all corresponding data.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The current model contains:

```
 feature remote-loopback {
   description
     "This feature means the device supports remote loopback";
  reference
     "IEEE Std 802.3, 57.1.2:b,30.3.6.1.6 aOAMLocalConfiguration, and
      30.3.6.1.7 aOAMRemoteConfiguration";
 }
```

Change this text to read:

```
 feature remote-loopback-initiate {
   description
     "This feature means the device supports being the initiator of remote loopback";
   reference
     "IEEE Std 802.3, 57.1.2:b and 30.3.6.1.6 aOAMLocalConfiguration";
 }
 feature remote-loopback-respond {
   description
     "This feature means the device supports responding to remote loopback control
OAMPDUs received from the peer";
    reference
     "IEEE Std 802.3, 57.1.2:b and
      30.3.6.1.7 aOAMRemoteConfiguration";
 }
```

This separates the feature into local and remote capability.

Cl **8** *SC* **8.5.2** *P* **153** *L* **52** # 345

Trowbridge, Steve Nokia

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A**

The description says the device supports link monitoring. From the description it is not clear whether this means support for initiating a threshold crossing event to the peer side, or support receiving and reporting on events received from the peer side, or both.
Assumption (from the references): it means support for both.

SuggestedRemedy

Split into 2 features to allow announcing the support for both procedures separately.
Make it clear in the description what it is about.
And apply the definition for all corresponding data.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #351

Cl **8** *SC* **8.5.2** *P* **154** *L* **4** # 346

Trowbridge, Steve Nokia

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **R**

The description says the device supports remote MIB retrieval. From the description it is not clear whether this means support initiating a variable requests to the peer side, or support receiving and replying to variable requests received from the peer side, or both.
Assumption (from the references): it means support for both.

SuggestedRemedy

Split into 2 features to allow announcing the support for both procedures separately.
Make it clear in the description what it is about.
And apply the definition for all corresponding data.

Response *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.

No specific changes are proposed.

Cl **8** *SC* **8.5.2** *P* **158** *L* **53** # 347

Trowbridge, Steve Nokia

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A**

The grouping 'intf-config' is defined but not used. Intentionally?
About the data that is defined in the grouping:
- the leaf 'mib-retrieval' is also part of the 'discovery-info' 'local' 'functions-supported'.
- In the same discovery-info container there are also the leafs 'loopback' and the 'uni-directional-link-fault', and also those have a corresponding leave in the grouping intf-config.
Is the discovery-info what is announced during the discovery?

SuggestedRemedy

Either add the proper uses statement such that the grouping intf-config is used (and it becomes clear what it is to be used for), or remove the grouping statement.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Remove grouping 'intf-config'

Cl **8** *SC* **8.5.2** *P* **159** *L* **29** # 312

Cheng, Weiying Coriant

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A**

udlf is not well known acronyms, suggest use unidireciotnal-link-fault instead of udlf to make it more clear and also keep consistent with other leaf names such as mib-retrival, remote-loopback, etc

SuggestedRemedy

Replace 'udlf' with 'undirectional-link-fault'

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Comment type was changed from E to T

Text removed per comment #347

Cl **8** *SC* **8.5.2** *P* **161** *L* **26** # 348

Trowbridge, Steve Nokia

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **R**

The leaf running-total is defined with the type uint64. ietf-yang-types.yang contains a type counter64. Using this type is the strategy used in ieee802-ethernet-interface.yang.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the type of the counters from uint64 into counter64.

Response *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.

There is a difference in behavior between uint64 and counter64 - counters are expected to wrap around. We do not want to change the default expected behavior for the given leaf.

Cl **8** *SC* **8.5.2** *P* **161** *L* **26** # 359

Trowbridge, Steve Nokia

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A**

The leaf event-total is defined with the type uint32. ietf-yang-types.yang contains a type counter32 (and counter64). Using these types is the strategy used in ieee802-ethernet-interface.yang.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the type of the counters from uint32 into counter32.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change the type of variables from uint32 into uint64, when the attribute is clearly NOT a counter. When the attribute is a counter (based on description), change to counter64.

Cl **8** *SC* **8.5.2** *P* **161** *L* **55** # 360

Trowbridge, Steve Nokia

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A**

The grouping statistics-common contains a lot of counters, all mandatory. Does it make sense to make it mandatory to support a counter in devices that do not support a particular function?
E.g. shall a device that does not support the feature 'remote-mib-retrieval' support the counter 'variable-request-tx (and other counters)'

SuggestedRemedy

Define the counters with the proper if-feature statement. This makes the counters mandatory if the corresponding procedure / feature is supported but not present in case the procedure / feature is not supported.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #344 for feature definition

The current model contains within the grouping statistics-common:
(note that the leafs are defined mandatory):

```
leaf loopback-control-tx {
  type uint32;
  mandatory true;

leaf loopback-control-rx {
  type uint32;
  mandatory true;
```

Replace this by:

```
leaf loopback-control-tx {
  if-feature remote-loopback-initiate;
  type uint32;
  mandatory true;

leaf loopback-control-rx {
  if-feature remote-loopback-respond;
  type uint32;
  mandatory true;
```

A device that does not support the initiating of loopback should not be forced counting the number of loopbacks it initiated.

Cl **8** *SC* **8.5.2** *P* **166** *L* **26** # 361

Trowbridge, Steve Nokia

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **R**

The grouping discovery-local contains various configuration parameters. It does not make sense to have a configuration parameter for a procedure that is not supported. Hence these parameters should be coupled to the feature.

SuggestedRemedy

Add a proper if-feature statement to the leaf uni-directional-link-fault. Being a configuration parameter: is it possible to define a default? If no default: what shall be announced during discovery if nothing is configured? Is the content of the operational datastore equal to what is announced? What is stored in the operational datastore if the link-oam admin-state is disabled?

Response *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.

Lack of specific suggested changes.

Cl **8** *SC* **8.5.2** *P* **166** *L* **32** # 362

Trowbridge, Steve Nokia

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A**

Same issue as comment on line 26

SuggestedRemedy

Add a proper if-feature statement to the leaf loopback. Being a configuration parameter: is it possible to define a default? If no default: what shall be announced during discovery if nothing is configured? Is the content of the operational datastore equal to what is announced? What is stored in the operational datastore if the link-oam admin-state is disabled?

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #344 for feature definition

The container discovery-info / sub-container local, has a uses statement ‘uses discovery-local’

Within the grouping discovery-local’, replace

```
leaf loopback {
  type boolean;
```

with:

```
leaf loopback {
  if-feature remote-loopback-initiate;
  type boolean;
  default true;
```

No need for a configuration parameter for functions that are announced as not being supported. Add a default value for those systems that do support the function.

Cl **8** *SC* **8.5.2** *P* **168** *L* **34** # 363

Trowbridge, Steve Nokia

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **R**

Same issue as comment on page 166 line 26

SuggestedRemedy

Add a proper if-feature statement to the leaf mib-retrieval. Being a configuration parameter: is it possible to define a default? If no default: what shall be announced during discovery if nothing is configured? Is the content of the operational datastore equal to what is announced? What is stored in the operational datastore if the link-oam admin-state is disabled?

Response *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.

Lack of specific suggested changes.

Cl **8** *SC* **8.5.2** *P* **168** *L* **50** # 364

Trowbridge, Steve Nokia

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **R**

The leaf mtu is defined with the type uint32.
802.3-2012, Table 57-9 defines the maximum OAMPDU size as an 11 bit field.

SuggestedRemedy

Consider defining it as uint16 with a proper range statement included.

Response *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.

There is no issue with specifying it as a larger value.

Cl **8** *SC* **8.5.2** *P* **169** *L* **23** # 365

Trowbridge, Steve Nokia

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A**

Does a device that does not support the loopback procedure have to report on the loopback-status?

SuggestedRemedy

Add a proper if-feature statement.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The ‘grouping discovery-info’ contains in a sub-container local:

```
leaf loopback-mode {
  type loopback-status;
```

Replace this with:

```
leaf loopback-mode {
  if-feature " remote-loopback-initiate or remote-loopback-respond";
  type loopback-status;
```

The ‘grouping discovery-info’ contains in a sub-container remote:

```
leaf loopback-mode {
  type loopback-status;
```

Replace this with:

```
leaf loopback-mode {
  if-feature "remote-loopback-initiate";
  type loopback-status;
```

Cl **8** *SC* **8.5.2** *P* **170** *L* **28** # 366

Trowbridge, Steve Nokia

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A**

The container 'link-oam' is defined within the container 'ethernet'.
The container 'ethernet' is defined within an interface with a when condition < when "derived-from-or-self(if:type, 'ianaift:ethernetCsmacd')" >.
This automatically implies that link-oam is available only for interfaces of the type 'ethernetCsmacd'.
Issue:
BBF wants to use the EFM OAM model on other interfaces such as 'ptm'. The data defined in ieee802-ethernet-interface.yang in container 'ethernet' is not applicable on ptm interfaces.

SuggestedRemedy

Provide the container 'link-oam' directly as an augment within the interface with a when condition that allows ethernetCsmacd or ptm. (compare with the 802.1X YANG model)

Response *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The current module contains:

```
augment "/if:interfaces/if:interface/eth-if:ethernet" {
  description
    "Augments ethernet interface model with nodes
     specific to Ethernet Link OAM";

  container link-oam {
    presence
      "Implies Link OAM is configured on the interface";
    description
      "Interface operational state for Ethernet Link OAM";
```

The proposal is to replace this with (change marked with >>>><<<<):

```
augment >>>>"/if:interfaces/if:interface" {
 when "if:type = 'ianaift:ethernetCsmacd' or if:type = 'ianaift:ptm'<<<<" {
   description
     "Augments ethernet interface model with nodes
      specific to Ethernet Link OAM";
   container link-oam {
     description
       "Interface operational state for Ethernet Link OAM";
```

Motivation:
This change is needed to allow the use of this YANG model for EFM OAM on PTM interfaces. While the change is essential for PTM interfaces, it does not change anything for IEEE specified ethernet interfaces. The when condition unambiguously ties it to the ethernet interface and as such provides the context (refer to proposed response on comment #367).

Cl **8** *SC* **8.5.2** *P* **170** *L* **57** # 368

Trowbridge, Steve Nokia

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **R**

Understanding of the 'leaf rx-fault': if a device supports uni-directional-link-fault on one of its links, then the feature shall be supported. In that case the leaf becomes mandatory for all links, even those where the feature is not supported. Why is the leaf mandatory?
Assumption: in case the feature is not supported on a particular link, then the leaf has always the value 'false'.

SuggestedRemedy

Clarify in the description what a device shall do on interfaces that do not support uni-directional-link-faults.

Response *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.

Lack of specific suggested changes.

Cl **8** *SC* **8.5.2** *P* **171** *L* **41** # 369

Trowbridge, Steve Nokia

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **R**

This container statistics contains local and remote statistics.
Aren't the local-error counters the data sent to the peer side via the event notification message?
Aren't the remote statistics counters for data received from the peer side via the event notification messages?
Shouldn' this be coupled to a feature?
Assumption: the leafs always contain the value sent / received of the last message.

SuggestedRemedy

Add the proper if-feature statements to the leafs.
Or preferably group them into two containers, one for local and one for remote data and add the if-feature statement at the container definition.

Response *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.

Lack of specific suggested changes.

Cl **8** *SC* **8.5.2** *P* **171** *L* **41** # 370

Trowbridge, Steve Nokia

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A**

The container statistics contains counters that are defined with the type uint32. ietf-yang-types.yang contains a type counter32 (and counter64). Using these types is the strategy used in ieee802-ethernet-interface.yang.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the type of the counters from uint32 into counter32.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change the type of variables from uint32 into uint64, when the attribute is clearly NOT a counter. When the attribute is a counter (based on description), change to counter64.

Cl **8** *SC* **8.5.2** *P* **172** *L* **54** # 371

Trowbridge, Steve Nokia

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **R**

There is no data defined nor an rpc that corresponds to the procedure of sending a Variable request / receiving and reporting on a Variable response. Is this intentional? Is this procedurre to be modeled vendor specific?

SuggestedRemedy

Make a standard model to support the procedure that allows the operator to trigger a Variable request to the peer side, and to report on the result.

Response *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.

Lack of specific suggested changes.

Cl **8** *SC* **8.5.2** *P* **173** *L* **3** # 313

Cheng, Weiying Coriant

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **R**

Is any reason to comment PRC out and remove them in future? Reset stats is a useful for operator so suggest to keep this funciton.

SuggestedRemedy

keep RPCs for reset stats

Response *Response Status* **W**

REJECT.

The TF has decided NOT to include RPCs.

Cl **8** *SC* **8.5.2** *P* **173** *L* **7** # 349

Trowbridge, Steve Nokia

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **R**

The YANG 1.0 approach to model the rpc reset-stats is to define it at the highest level in the YANG tree and specify the interface as a parameter (as done), but in YANG 1.1 it also allows to specify it as an action within an interface in which case the interface is not needed as a parameter inside the rpc.
Why is the first approach selected?

SuggestedRemedy

Change to YANG 1.1 syntax and use an action.

Response *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.

Lack of specific suggested changes.

Cl **8** *SC* **8.5.2** *P* **173** *L* **24** # 350

Trowbridge, Steve Nokia

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A**

The YANG 1.0 approach to model the rpc remote-loopback is to define it at the highest level in the YANG tree and specify the interface as a parameter (as done), but in YANG 1.1 it also allows to specify it as an action within an interface in which case the interface is not needed as a parameter inside the rpc.
Why is the first approach selected?

SuggestedRemedy

Change to YANG 1.1 syntax and use an action.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #344 for feature definition.

Replace the existing text

rpc remote-loopback

by an action using YANG 1.1 style definition. The position of defining the action shall be within the link-oam container, i.e., after the closing bracket of page 172, line 51, before the last closing bracket of page 172 line 52.

```
action remote-loopback {
  if-feature remote-loopback-initiate;
  description
    "Start/stop remote loopback on the specified interface.";
  reference
    "IEEE Std 802.3, 57.1.2:b";
  input {
    leaf enable {
      type boolean;
      mandatory true;
      description
        "Whether to enable or disable remote loopback.";
    }
  }
  output {
    leaf success {
      type boolean;
      mandatory true;
      description
        "True if the operation was successful, false otherwise.";
    }
    leaf error-message {
      type string;
```

```
        description
          "If the operation failed, optionally used to provide extra
           details.";
        }
      }
    }
  }
```

Cl **8** *SC* **8.5.2** *P* **174** *L* **18** # 351

Trowbridge, Steve Nokia

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A**

The notification treshold-event is defined at highest level in the schema tree. The result is that they are generated without interface information. This is probably not the intention.

SuggestedRemedy

Add a leaf that identifies the interface for which the notification is generated.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #344 for feature definition

Implement 2 changes:
- Use YANG 1.1 syntax and move the notification within the link-oam container (this solves the problem of identifying the interface)
- Combine with the comment #345 (i.e., split the feature link-monitoring as explained above or comment #344).

Results in the following definition:

```
  notification threshold-event {
    if-feature "link-monitoring-local or link-monitoring-remote";
    description
      "This notification is sent when a local threshold
       crossing event is detected.";
    uses event-details {
      refine event-type {
        must ". = 'threshold-event-type'" {
          description
            "This leaf is set to 'threshold-event-type'";
        }
      }
    }
  }
```

But most important: it is defined before the closing bracket of the link-oam container, i.e., after the closing bracket of page 172, line 51, before the last closing bracket of page 172 line 52.

Cl **8** *SC* **8.5.2** *P* **174** *L* **38** # 352

Trowbridge, Steve Nokia

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **R**

Same issue as comment on line 18 for notification non-threshold-event

SuggestedRemedy

Add a leaf that identifies the interface for which the notification is generated.

Response *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.

Lack of specific suggested changes.

Cl **8** *SC* **8.5.3** *P* **166** *L* **54** # 326

Remein, Duane Huawei

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *bucket*

Odd way to end a description <<P> ";"
Same issue pg 167 line 24. Other locations may exist but are difficult to locae in pdf, might be easier to loacate in Frame.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the extraneous line feed (here after "900 seconds", on pg 167 after "frame error"). Search in frame for other locations and correct.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Cl **802** *SC* **802.3cf** *P* **23** *L* **28** # 380

Jethanandani, Mahesh Xoriant

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *from-the-floor, rfc7223*

Import of ietf-yang-types does not carry a reference statement. See Section 3.9, RFC6087bis

SuggestedRemedy

Add reference statement in the import. Example - reference "RFC 7223 IETF Interface YANG model (as of this publication)

Response *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Comment type changed from ER to E (commenter is not an 802.3 WG balloter)

See comment #382

Cl **Content** *SC* **Contents** *P* **13** *L* **1** # 215

Graber, Steffen Pepperl+Fuchs GmbH

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A** *bucket*

Page numbers 10 to 12 are missing.

SuggestedRemedy

Correct page numbering.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.