

## Proposed Responses

## IEEE P802.3cf D2.0 YANG Data Model Definitions Initial Working Group ballot comments

CI **00** SC P L # **284**  
David Tremblay Hewlett Packard Enter

Comment Type **T** Comment Status **D**  
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

Proposed Response Response Status **W**  
PROPOSED 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)

CI **FM** SC **FM** P L # **227**  
Anslow, Pete Ciena

Comment Type **ER** Comment Status **D** 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.

Proposed Response Response Status **W**  
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI **FM** SC **FM** P1 L1 # **270**  
Healey, Adam Broadcom Ltd.

Comment Type **E** Comment Status **D** 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.

Proposed Response Response Status **W**  
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI **FM** SC **FM** P7 L4 # **269**  
Healey, Adam Broadcom Ltd.

Comment Type **E** Comment Status **D** 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)".

Proposed Response Response Status **W**  
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI **FM** SC **FM** P12 L66 # **192**  
Hajduczenia, Charter

Comment Type **E** Comment Status **D** bucket, copyright year  
Copyright release year shows as 2017

SuggestedRemedy  
Change all copyright year entries from 2017 to 2018

Proposed Response Response Status **W**  
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI **FM** SC **FM** P13 L1 # **249**  
Yseboodt, Lennart Philips Lighting

Comment Type **ER** Comment Status **D** 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.

Proposed Response Response Status **W**  
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Proposed Responses

IEEE P802.3cf D2.0 YANG Data Model Definitions Initial Working Group ballot comments

Cl 00 SC P26 L14 # 237  
 Franchuk, Brian Emerson Automation  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket  
 "statistics" should be "statistics" (missing 's')  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Fix spelling  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 00 SC P26 L17 # 238  
 Franchuk, Brian Emerson Automation  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket  
 "statistics" should be "statistics" (missing 's')  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Fix spelling.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 00 SC P63 L # 239  
 Franchuk, Brian Emerson Automation  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket  
 Page content is clipped.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Fit content to page or use alternate page format (landscape).  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 00 SC 0 P L # 229  
 Anslow, Pete Ciena  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D 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  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 00 SC 0 P L # 228  
 Anslow, Pete Ciena  
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D 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).  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED 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 802.3.1a into Clause 2.

Cl 00 SC 0 P L # 226  
 Anslow, Pete Ciena  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D 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.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Proposed Responses

IEEE P802.3cf D2.0 YANG Data Model Definitions Initial Working Group ballot comments

Cl 00 SC 0 P1 L1 # 236  
 Kolesar, Paul CommScope

Comment Type T Comment Status D

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).

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.

While the commenter is correct in his observation, this comment should be brought to the attention of the 802.3WG at large, since it affects all projects, not just this one.

Cl 00 SC 0 P9 L1 # 277  
 Healey, Adam Broadcom Ltd.

Comment Type E Comment Status D 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.

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 00 SC 0 P9 L55 # 285  
 Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI,

Comment Type E Comment Status D 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

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 00 SC 0 P10 L1 # 197  
 McDermott, Thomas retired

Comment Type ER Comment Status D 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.

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 00 SC 0 P10 L60 # 205  
 Slavick, Jeff Broadcom Ltd

Comment Type E Comment Status D 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

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

## Proposed Responses

## IEEE P802.3cf D2.0 YANG Data Model Definitions Initial Working Group ballot comments

Cl 00 SC 0 P31 L28 # 382  
 Jethanandani, Mahesh Xoriant  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D 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)  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Comment type changes from ER to TR  
 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 P31 L28 # 381  
 Jethanandani, Mahesh Xoriant  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D 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)  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Comment type changes from ER to TR  
 Duplicate of comment #382

Cl 00 SC 0 P32 L2 # 372  
 Jethanandani, Mahesh Xoriant  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D 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)  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Comment type changes from ER to TR  
 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 P32 L25 # 373  
 Jethanandani, Mahesh Xoriant  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D 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.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED 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.

Cl 00 SC 0 P34 L57 # 374  
 Jethanandani, Mahesh Xoriant  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D 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.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Insert statement "default true;" under "type boolean;" in "leaf enable"

## Proposed Responses

## IEEE P802.3cf D2.0 YANG Data Model Definitions Initial Working Group ballot comments

Cl 00 SC 0 P35 L49 # 375  
 Jethanandani, Mahesh Xoriant  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D from-the-floor, speed  
 Same comment as row 25  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Use Mb/s and scale up from there to represent speeds.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 See comment #373

Cl 00 SC 0 P36 L24 # 376  
 Jethanandani, Mahesh Xoriant  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D 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.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

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 P37 L24 # 377  
 Jethanandani, Mahesh Xoriant  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D 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.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.

Leaf description is clear enough at this time. There is no default value, it is expected to be set by the device itself depending on its configuration.

Cl 00 SC 0 P37 L47 # 378  
 Jethanandani, Mahesh Xoriant  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D 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.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 See comment #376

Cl 00 SC 0 P39 L6 # 379  
 Jethanandani, Mahesh Xoriant  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D from-the-floor  
 Can leaf max-frame-len carry a default value? 1522?  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Add a default value for the leaf.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.

Clause 30 aMaxFrameLength attribute contains no default value definition.

## Proposed Responses

## IEEE P802.3cf D2.0 YANG Data Model Definitions Initial Working Group ballot comments

Cl 00 SC 0 P175 L # 276  
 Healey, Adam Broadcom Ltd.

Comment Type TR Comment Status D 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.

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Remove Annex 5A

Cl 00 SC 6.5.2 P67 L3 # 266  
 Lapak, Jeff UNH-IOL

Comment Type T Comment Status D

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."

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 1 SC 1 P13 L4 # 302  
 Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI,

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

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."

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED 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 802.3-2018."

## Proposed Responses

## IEEE P802.3cf D2.0 YANG Data Model Definitions Initial Working Group ballot comments

Cl 1 SC 1 P13 L6 # 353  
Trowbridge, Steve Nokia

Comment Type ER Comment Status D

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.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The PAR and objectives are not project date specific - TF needs to figure out what the cut off is, i.e., everything 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 flight at this time.

Cl 1 SC 1 P13 L6 # 329  
Remein, Duane Huawei

Comment Type T Comment Status D

This para mentions everything except Ethernet Link OAM.

## SuggestedRemedy

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

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Comment type was changed from E to T

See comment #302.

Cl 1 SC 1 P14 L66 # 194  
Hajduczenia, Charter

Comment Type E Comment Status D 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

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 1 SC 1 P16 L11 # 315  
Cheng, Weiyang Coriant

Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket

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

## SuggestedRemedy

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

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 1 SC 1.2 P13 L27 # 330  
Powell, Bill Nokia

Comment Type E Comment Status D

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."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED 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 a 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 P16 L34 # 200  
Hidaka, Yasuo Independent

Comment Type E Comment Status D 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."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 1 SC 1.3 P13 L42 # 242  
Marris, Arthur Cadence Design Syste

Comment Type TR Comment Status D 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.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #193 for TBD in 1.3  
See comment #229 for all remaining TBDs

Cl 1 SC 1.3 P13 L42 # 204  
Slavick, Jeff Broadcom Ltd

Comment Type ER Comment Status D TBD in 1.3

Section 1.3 is TBD

*SuggestedRemedy*

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

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #193

Cl 1 SC 1.3 P13 L43 # 193  
Hajduczenia, Charter

Comment Type T Comment Status D 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)."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Proposed Responses

IEEE P802.3cf D2.0 YANG Data Model Definitions Initial Working Group ballot comments

Cl 1 SC 1.3 P13 L43 # 303  
 Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI,  
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D 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  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 See comment #193

Cl 1 SC 1.3 P16 L40 # 201  
 Hidaka, Yasuo Independent  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D 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.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 See comment #193

Cl 1 SC 1.3 P16 L42 # 271  
 Healey, Adam Broadcom Ltd.  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D 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.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 See comment #193

Cl 1 SC 1.3 P16 L42 # 316  
 Cheng, Weiyang Coriant  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D TBD in 1.3  
 Need to have contents for review or remove this clause.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 See comment #193

Cl 1 SC 1.4 P17 L7 # 246  
 Winkel, Ludwig Siemens AG  
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D bucket  
 Missing full stop at the end of the sentence  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Add full stop at the end of the sentence  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 2 SC 2 P16 L4 # 250  
 Yseboodt, Lennart Philips Lighting  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D  
 "(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)."  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 Text is part of the template and adopted verbatim from the official 802.3 template.

## Proposed Responses

## IEEE P802.3cf D2.0 YANG Data Model Definitions Initial Working Group ballot comments

Cl 2 SC 2 P16 L9 # 233  
 Anslow, Pete Ciena  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D 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  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
 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 P16 L35 # 286  
 Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI,  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D 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  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
 See comment #233

Cl 3 SC 3 P21 L10 # 317  
 Cheng, Weiying Coriant  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D  
 Miss RESTCONF-based operations since it can access Yang module as well  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Replace 'NETCONF-based operations' with 'NETCONF-based and RESTCONF-based operations'  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 3 SC 3 P21 L65 # 272  
 Healey, Adam Broadcom Ltd.  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D 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.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 3 SC 3.2 P18 L12 # 195  
 Hajduczenia, Charter  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D bucket  
 >>"compilable"<< is not really a word  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change to "can be compiled"  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 3 SC 3.2 P21 L12 # 251  
 Yseboodt, Lennart Philips Lighting  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D 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.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 There is no "compatible" but "compilable". See comment #195

Proposed Responses

IEEE P802.3cf D2.0 YANG Data Model Definitions Initial Working Group ballot comments

Cl 4 SC P20 L4 # 241  
 Marris, Arthur Cadence Design Syste  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D 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.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED 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 P20 L4 # 196  
 Hajduczenia, Charter  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D term definition  
 Remove line "TERM definition"  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 It is a left over from early draft days  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
 See comment #206

Cl 4 SC 4 P20 L4 # 206  
 Slavick, Jeff Broadcom Ltd  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D term definition  
 The line "TERM definition" is a heading for the columns of information that follow. I thought you were stating the abbrevaiton 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:"  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 4 SC 4 P23 L4 # 252  
 Yseboodt, Lennart Philips Lighting  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D term definition  
 In the abbreviations we have:  
 "TERM definition"  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Delete "TERM definition"  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
 See comment #206

Cl 4 SC 4 P23 L4 # 273  
 Healey, Adam Broadcom Ltd.  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D 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.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 See comment #206

Proposed Responses

IEEE P802.3cf D2.0 YANG Data Model Definitions Initial Working Group ballot comments

Cl 4 SC 4 P23 L8 # 318  
 Cheng, Weiyang Coriant  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D  
 Miss RESTCONF  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Add 'RESTCONF Restful Configuration Protocol'  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 5 SC 5.1 P25 L4 # 244  
 Winkel, Ludwig Siemens AG  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D 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  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 5 SC 5.1 P25 L13 # 247  
 Winkel, Ludwig Siemens AG  
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D bucket  
 "this clause" is ambiguous, see also style guide.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Replace by "Clause 5"  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Text deleted under comment #244

Cl 5 SC 5.2 P22 L14 # 287  
 Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI,  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D 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  
 Repartition between active and deprecated clauses of IEEE Std 802.3  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 See comment #268

Cl 5 SC 5.2 P25 L12 # 319  
 Cheng, Weiyang Coriant  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket  
 replace 'focused' with 'to be focused on'  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED 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 P25 L15 # 268  
 Jones, Peter Cisco

Comment Type TR Comment Status D 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 related 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"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED 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 P25 L16 # 320  
 Cheng, Weiyang Coriant

Comment Type T Comment Status D eth-legacy

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

#### SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #268

Cl 5 SC 5.3 P23 L1 # 210  
 Slavick, Jeff Broadcom Ltd

Comment Type T Comment Status D

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 "corresponding Clause 30" entries on the right side

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED 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 Clause 30.

Cl 5 SC 5.3 P23 L9 # 211  
 Slavick, Jeff Broadcom Ltd

Comment Type T Comment Status D

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

#### SuggestedRemedy

Change N/A N/A to oAutoNegotiaion aAutoNegAdminControl

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Proposed Responses

IEEE P802.3cf D2.0 YANG Data Model Definitions Initial Working Group ballot comments

Cl 5 SC 5.3 P23 L9 # 212  
 Slavick, Jeff Broadcom Ltd  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D  
 Doesn't the auto-negotiation/status correspond to aAutoNegAutoConfig  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change N/A N/A to oAutoNegotiaion aAutoNegAutoConfig  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 5 SC 5.3 P24 L9 # 207  
 Slavick, Jeff Broadcom Ltd  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D 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  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED 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 reference in Clause 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 P24 L11 # 208  
 Slavick, Jeff Broadcom Ltd  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D 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  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 See comment #207

Cl 5 SC 5.3 P24 L22 # 209  
 Slavick, Jeff Broadcom Ltd  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D 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  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 See comment #207

Cl 5 SC 5.3 P25 L26 # 274  
 Healey, Adam Broadcom Ltd.  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D 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.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
 See comment #233

Cl 5 SC 5.3 P26 L1 # 253  
Yseboodt, Lennart Philips Lighting

Comment Type ER Comment Status D

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 column 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.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED 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 P26 L15 # 216  
Graber, Steffen Pepperl+Fuchs GmbH

Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket

statistics (missing 's' within statistics)

SuggestedRemedy

statistics

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 5 SC 5.3 P26 L17 # 217  
Graber, Steffen Pepperl+Fuchs GmbH

Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket

statistics (missing 's' within statistics)

SuggestedRemedy

statistics

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 5 SC 5.3 P26 L41 # 202  
Hidaka, Yasuo Independent

Comment Type E Comment Status D 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.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 5 SC 5.3 P27 L11 # 333  
Trowbridge, Steve Nokia

Comment Type T Comment Status D

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.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED 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, causing interpretation confusion.

Proposed Responses

IEEE P802.3cf D2.0 YANG Data Model Definitions Initial Working Group ballot comments

Cl 5 SC 5.3 P27 L16 # 334  
 Trowbridge, Steve Nokia  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D  
 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.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 See comment #333

Cl 5 SC 5.3 P27 L18 # 335  
 Trowbridge, Steve Nokia  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D  
 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.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 See comment #333

Cl 5 SC 5.3 P27 L30 # 336  
 Trowbridge, Steve Nokia  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D  
 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.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 See comment #333

Cl 5 SC 5.3 P27 L32 # 337  
 Trowbridge, Steve Nokia  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D  
 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.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 See comment #333

Cl 5 SC 5.4 P L29 # 245  
 Winkel, Ludwig Siemens AG  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D bucket  
 Same title as in 5.4.2 is confusing.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Replace one of the titles, so that there is a difference.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED 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 P29 L1 # 254  
 Yseboodt, Lennart Philips Lighting

Comment Type ER Comment Status D

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.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED 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 P29 L1 # 275  
 Healey, Adam Broadcom Ltd.

Comment Type E Comment Status D 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.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 5 SC 5.4 P29 L6 # 283  
 Brad Booth Microsoft

Comment Type E Comment Status D

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.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED 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 P31 L3 # 265  
 Lapak, Jeff UNH-IOL

Comment Type T Comment Status D

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."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 5 SC 5.4.2 P37 L47 # 328  
 Remein, Duane Huawei

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

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-pkts' should be 'out-unicast-pkts' 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.

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 5 SC 5.4.2.1 P29 L5 # 288  
 Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI,

Comment Type ER Comment Status D

"Restructured 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.

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change

"Restructed to be NMDA compliant."

to

"Restructured to be NMDA compliant."

Cl 5 SC 5.4.2.1 P29 L35 # 177  
 Hajduczenia, Charter

Comment Type E Comment Status D 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

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 5 SC 5.4.2.1 P29 L41 # 321  
 Cheng, Weiyang Coriant

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

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

SuggestedRemedy

Add RPCs to reset interface stats

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.

No specific proposal provided.

Cl 5 SC 5.4.2.1 P29 L47 # 289  
Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI,

Comment Type TR Comment Status D 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

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #268

I believe the use of "half" value (indicating half duplex) in duplex-type typedef 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 P31 L20 # 178  
Hajduczenia, Charter

Comment Type T Comment Status D bucket

"XXX" denotes a missing reference (likely)

*SuggestedRemedy*

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

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Changed comment type from E to T.

Remove "XXX, reference the general interface configuration."

Cl 5 SC 5.4.2.1 P33 L19 # 304  
Cheng, Weiyong Coriant

Comment Type ER Comment Status D bucket

Typo 'dicard', should be 'discarded'

*SuggestedRemedy*

change to 'discarded'

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 5 SC 5.4.2.1 P33 L24 # 305  
Cheng, Weiyong Coriant

Comment Type T Comment Status D

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

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED 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.";

Proposed Responses

IEEE P802.3cf D2.0 YANG Data Model Definitions Initial Working Group ballot comments

Cl 5 SC 5.4.2.1 P33 L41 # 306  
 Cheng, Weiyang Coriant  
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D bucket  
 Typo, two 'PAUSE frame base' here before 'flow control setting'  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Remove one of them  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 5 SC 5.4.2.1 P33 L57 # 338  
 Trowbridge, Steve Nokia  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D  
 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 applicability and their usage/meaning.  
 An extra section in annex 5A?  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 Relationship between individual modules is already expressed through import and inheritance between individual modules.

Cl 5 SC 5.4.2.1 P34 L19 # 307  
 Cheng, Weiyang Coriant  
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D  
 What XXX mean?  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Replace XXX with specific parameters or remove them if not.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Remove "XXX, reference the general interface configuration."

Cl 5 SC 5.4.2.1 P34 L47 # 339  
Trowbridge, Steve Nokia

Comment Type T Comment Status D 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.

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED 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.

As a general observation, the fact that an leaf is writeable, gives the remote management station ability to change the setting. The value into the given leaf may be also set by the local station to a specific value, depending on the operating conditions.

Cl 5 SC 5.4.2.1 P34 L50 # 179  
Hajduczenia, Charter

Comment Type T Comment Status D 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."

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Comment type was changed from E to T

Cl 5 SC 5.4.2.1 P35 L41 # 340  
Trowbridge, Steve Nokia

Comment Type T Comment Status D 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.

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #339

Cl 5 SC 5.4.2.1 P35 L46 # 180  
Hajduczenia, Charter

Comment Type E Comment Status D 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

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 5 SC 5.4.2.1 P35 L50 # 341  
Trowbridge, Steve Nokia

Comment Type T Comment Status D 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.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #339

Cl 5 SC 5.4.2.1 P36 L11 # 342  
Trowbridge, Steve Nokia

Comment Type T Comment Status D r/w properties

The model defines some RW attributes.  
For the flow-control pause direction it is described 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.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #339

Cl 5 SC 5.4.2.1 P36 L14 # 231  
Anslow, Pete Ciena

Comment Type E Comment Status D 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

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 5 SC 5.4.2.1 P37 L24 # 343  
Trowbridge, Steve Nokia

Comment Type T Comment Status D 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-negotiation 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.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #339

Cl 5 SC 5.4.2.1 P37 L50 # 308  
Cheng, Weiyong Coriant

Comment Type ER Comment Status D todo-container-statistics

Does 'TODO' mean this is not completed?

*SuggestedRemedy*

Complete the description for the review

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #179

## Proposed Responses

## IEEE P802.3cf D2.0 YANG Data Model Definitions Initial Working Group ballot comments

Cl 5 SC 5.4.2.1 P38 L17 # 181  
 Hajduczenia, Charter  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D  
 aFrameTooShortErrors is not defined anywhere  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Please provide definition for aFrameTooShortErrors  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED 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 P38 L50 # 182  
 Hajduczenia, Charter  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D  
 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  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED 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 P39 L18 # 309  
 Cheng, Weiyang Coriant  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D bucket  
 macc' is a little confusing, suggest to say 'mac-control'  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 replace 'macc' with 'mac-control'  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED 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 P40 L22 # 183  
 Hajduczenia, Charter  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket  
 Remove text in lines 22-31  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 5 SC 5.4.2.1 P41 L1 # 184  
 Hajduczenia, Charter  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D  
 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  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED 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?"

## Proposed Responses

## IEEE P802.3cf D2.0 YANG Data Model Definitions Initial Working Group ballot comments

Cl 5 SC 5.4.2.1 P41 L25 # 255  
Yseboodt, Lennart Philips Lighting

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

There are a number of "// REVIEW NOTE" in the reproduced Yang models. The first occurrence 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

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Remove all REVIEW NOTE sections with associated text

Cl 5 SC 5.4.2.1 P47 L6 # 232  
Anslow, Pete Ciena

Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket

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

## SuggestedRemedy

Change "aTransmitPIMicroseconds" to "aTransmitLPIMicroseconds"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 5 SC 5.4.2.2 P49 L15 # 290  
Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI,

Comment Type TR Comment Status D 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

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #268

Cl 5 SC 5.4.2.2 P51 L46 # 185  
Hajduczenia, Charter

Comment Type T Comment Status D bucket

I do not believe this augmentation is needed

## SuggestedRemedy

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

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 5 SC 5.4.2.2 P53 L12 # 291  
Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI,

Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket

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

## SuggestedRemedy

change ptks to pkts globally

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

## Proposed Responses

## IEEE P802.3cf D2.0 YANG Data Model Definitions Initial Working Group ballot comments

Cl 5A SC P175 L13 # 243  
Marris, Arthur Cadence Design Syste  
Comment Type TR Comment Status D annex-5a  
This is just a place holder with no content  
SuggestedRemedy  
Add suitable content to Annwx 5A  
Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
See comment #276

Cl 5A SC 5A P L # 230  
Anslow, Pete Ciena  
Comment Type T Comment Status D annex-5a  
Annex 5A is incomplete  
SuggestedRemedy  
Add suitable text for Annex 5A  
Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
See comment #276

Cl 5A SC 5A P174 L1 # 358  
Trowbridge, Steve Nokia  
Comment Type TR Comment Status D annex-5a  
This Annex is virtually empty with the intro saying <some text> and the reference to 802.3 indicating 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  
Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
See comment #276

Cl 5A SC 5A P175 L1 # 314  
Cheng, Weiyong Coriant  
Comment Type ER Comment Status D annex-5a  
This Annex is incomplete and does not provide much information. Also where is Annex 1 to 4? Remove this Annex  
SuggestedRemedy  
Either remove Annex 5A or change it to Annex 1 and clean them up.  
Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
See comment #276

Cl 5A SC 5A.1 P174 L14 # 214  
Slavick, Jeff Broadcom Ltd  
Comment Type TR Comment Status D 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.  
Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
See comment #276

Cl 5A SC 5A.1 P175 L13 # 260  
Yseboodt, Lennart Philips Lighting  
Comment Type ER Comment Status D annex-5a  
"5A.1 Introduction  
<some text>"  
What is the point of this Annex ?  
SuggestedRemedy  
Either complete the contents; or remove the Annex 5A.  
Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
See comment #276

## Proposed Responses

## IEEE P802.3cf D2.0 YANG Data Model Definitions Initial Working Group ballot comments

**Cl 5A**    **SC 5A.1**                      **P175**        **L14**                      # **225**  
 Graber, Steffen                              Pepperl+Fuchs GmbH  
**Comment Type**    **E**                      **Comment Status**    **D**                      *annex-5a*  
 < some text> (remove this marker)  
**SuggestedRemedy**  
  
**Proposed Response**                      **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 See comment #276

**Cl 6**        **SC 6**                                      **P61**        **L1**                      # **256**  
 Yseboodt, Lennart                              Philips Lighting  
**Comment Type**    **TR**                      **Comment Status**    **D**  
 The definition of the YANG models should be updated to match with the additional Clause 30 objects created by P802.3bt.  
**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Per comment.  
**Proposed Response**                      **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED 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**                                      **P61**        **L12**                      # **240**  
 Marris, Arthur                                      Cadence Design Syste  
**Comment Type**    **T**                                      **Comment Status**    **D**                      *bucket*  
 It would read better if "will allow for" is changed to "allow"  
**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Change "will allow for" to "allow"  
**Proposed Response**                      **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Cl 6**        **SC 6.3**                                      **P59**        **L1**                      # **355**  
 Trowbridge, Steve                              Nokia  
**Comment Type**    **ER**                                      **Comment Status**    **D**                      *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  
**Proposed Response**                      **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Cl 6**        **SC 6.3**                                      **P59**        **L14**                      # **299**  
 Zimmerman, George                              CME Consulting/ADI,  
**Comment Type**    **TR**                                      **Comment Status**    **D**                      *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 interoperability 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 management 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.  
**Proposed Response**                      **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 See comment #296.

**Cl 6**        **SC 6.3**                                      **P59**        **L16**                      # **292**  
 Zimmerman, George                              CME Consulting/ADI,  
**Comment Type**    **TR**                                      **Comment Status**    **D**  
 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  
**Proposed Response**                      **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Change R/W for pse-enable to R

Proposed Responses

IEEE P802.3cf D2.0 YANG Data Model Definitions Initial Working Group ballot comments

Cl 6 SC 6.3 P60 L1 # 186  
 Hajduczenia, Charter  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D page-60, bucket  
 Page orientation is messed up on Table 6-1  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Plase make sure page oriantation matched table alignment.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
 See comment #198

Cl 6 SC 6.3 P60 L1 # 198  
 McDermott, Thomas retired  
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D 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).  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 6 SC 6.3 P60 L3 # 213  
 Slavick, Jeff Broadcom Ltd  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D 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.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
 See comment #198

Cl 6 SC 6.3 P60 L10 # 293  
 Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI,  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D  
 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  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Change R/W for pse-enable to R

Cl 6 SC 6.3 P63 L1 # 278  
 Stover, David Analog Devices  
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D 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.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
 See comment #198.

Cl 6 SC 6.3 P63 L1 # 203  
 Hidaka, Yasuo Independent  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D 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.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
 See comment #198

## Proposed Responses

## IEEE P802.3cf D2.0 YANG Data Model Definitions Initial Working Group ballot comments

Cl 6 SC 6.3 P63 L6 # 257  
 Yseboodt, Lennart Philips Lighting  
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D 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.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 See comment #198

Cl 6 SC 6.4 P63 L37 # 264  
 Lapak, Jeff UNH-IOL  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket  
 Clause numbering scheme is inconsistent with Clause 5. This subclause 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.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 6 SC 6.4 P63 L58 # 218  
 Graber, Steffen Pepperl+Fuchs GmbH  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket  
 Some of the readable operational state in this module ... (states should be plural)  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Some of the readable operational states in this module ...  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 6 SC 6.4 P64 L1 # 279  
 Stover, David Analog Devices  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D 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.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 6 SC 6.4 P64 L1 # 258  
 Yseboodt, Lennart Philips Lighting  
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D bucket  
 Page is landscape without need.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Make page portrait orientation.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 6 SC 6.5.1 P62 L14 # 300  
 Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI,  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D  
 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  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The two poe-pse and podel-pse have separate containers for configuraitons which do not affect each other. Change "multiple-pair" to "PoE" and "single-pair" to "PoDL"

## Proposed Responses

## IEEE P802.3cf D2.0 YANG Data Model Definitions Initial Working Group ballot comments

**Cl 6**    **SC 6.5.2**    **P67**    **L1**    # **259**  
 Yseboodt, Lennart    Philips Lighting

**Comment Type ER**    **Comment Status D**    *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.

**Proposed Response**    **Response Status W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

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

**Cl 6**    **SC 6.5.2**    **P67**    **L18**    # **234**  
 Anslow, Pete    Ciena

**Comment Type E**    **Comment Status D**    *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"

**Proposed Response**    **Response Status W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Cl 6**    **SC 6.5.2**    **P67**    **L22**    # **294**  
 Zimmerman, George    CME Consulting/ADI,

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

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.

**Proposed Response**    **Response Status W**  
 PROPOSED 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**    **P68**    **L20**    # **295**  
 Zimmerman, George    CME Consulting/ADI,

**Comment Type T**    **Comment Status D**

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

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Include aPoDLPSEPowerClassification in the references

**Proposed Response**    **Response Status W**  
 PROPOSED 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**    **P68**    **L39**    # **187**  
 Hajduczenia,    Charter

**Comment Type E**    **Comment Status D**    *bucket*

Plenty of commnets (indicated with \*) in this module

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Remove all text withing /\* \*/ blocks

**Proposed Response**    **Response Status W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Cl 6**    **SC 6.5.2**    **P69**    **L35**    # **297**  
 Zimmerman, George    CME Consulting/ADI,

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

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)

**Proposed Response**    **Response Status W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The two poe-pse and podel-pse have separate containers for configuraitons which do not affect each other. Change "multiple-pair" to "PoE" and "single-pair" to "PoDL"

Proposed Responses

IEEE P802.3cf D2.0 YANG Data Model Definitions Initial Working Group ballot comments

Cl 6 SC 6.5.2 P69 L35 # 281  
 Stover, David Analog Devices  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket  
 Misspelled word  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change "unkown" to "unknown".  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 6 SC 6.5.2 P69 L44 # 296  
 Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI,  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D 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 interoperability 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).  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Update PoE YANG module per 802d3cf\_0318\_yan\_1.yang. Update PoE YANG tree per 802d3cf\_0318\_yan\_2.tree. Summary of changes:

- Change the "notation" from "PoE Port" to "PSE Port". Change the root node from "poe-pse" to "pse" to cover both PODL and PoE devices.
- Change "pse-pair-mode" to "supported-pse-type" to identify whether it is a poe or a podl port.
- Change the subcontainer name "multi-pair" to "poe" and "single-pair" to "podl".
- Change the contain name "poe-statistics" under "single-pair" container to "podl-statistics".

Cl 6 SC 6.5.2 P69 L48 # 188  
 Hajduczenia, Charter  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D .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  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED 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 P69 L48 # 301  
 Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI,  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D .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).  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED 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 P70 L8 # 298  
 Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI,  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D  
 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  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Proposed Responses

IEEE P802.3cf D2.0 YANG Data Model Definitions Initial Working Group ballot comments

Cl 6 SC 6.5.2 P71 L42 # 189  
 Hajduczenia, Charter  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D 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  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Use IEEE Std 802.3, Figure 33-9 for reference

Cl 6 SC 6.5.2 P72 L41 # 190  
 Hajduczenia, Charter  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket  
 "Pse" or "PSE" or "pse"?  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Pick one, use consistently in the whole document  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Use "PSE" consistently

Cl 6 SC 6.5.2 P74 L37 # 235  
 Anslow, Pete Ciena  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket  
 pdf page 74  
 printed page 77  
 "IEEE Std 802.3, 30.9.1.1.6 aPSEPowerClassification", but 30.9.1.1.6 is "aPoDLPSEDetectedPDPowerClass"  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change "aPSEPowerClassification", to "aPoDLPSEDetectedPDPowerClass"  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 6 SC 6.5.2 P75 L1 # 322  
 Remein, Duane Huawei  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D 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.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 6 SC 6.5.2 P76 L1 # 191  
 Hajduczenia, Charter  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket  
 Page oriantation should be horizontal  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Per comment  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 6 SC 6.5.2 P76 L35 # 280  
 Stover, David Analog Devices  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D 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.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Cl 6**    **SC 6.5.2**    **P77**    **L31**    # **282**  
 Stover, David    Analog Devices

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

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 multi-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.

**Proposed Response**    **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

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

**Cl 7**    **SC 7**    **P78**    **L**    # **263**  
 B, A    C

**Comment Type**    **T**    **Comment Status**    **D**    *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.

**Proposed Response**    **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #332

**Cl 7**    **SC 7**    **P79**    **L1**    # **219**  
 Graber, Steffen    Pepperl+Fuchs GmbH

**Comment Type**    **E**    **Comment Status**    **D**    *bucket*

Page numbers 79 and 80 are present two times.

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Correct page numbering.

**Proposed Response**    **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Cl 7**    **SC 7.1**    **P79**    **L1**    # **199**  
 McDermott, Thomas    retired

**Comment Type**    **ER**    **Comment Status**    **D**    *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.

**Proposed Response**    **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Cl 7**    **SC 7.2.1**    **P78**    **L17**    # **356**  
 Trowbridge, Steve    Nokia

**Comment Type**    **ER**    **Comment Status**    **D**

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.

**Proposed Response**    **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED REJECT.

Most of the text was taken verbatim from IEEE Std 802.3.1.

Proposed Responses

IEEE P802.3cf D2.0 YANG Data Model Definitions Initial Working Group ballot comments

Cl 7 SC 7.2.1.1 P78 L21 # 354  
 Trowbridge, Steve Nokia  
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D  
 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, ..."  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED 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, Clause 57, 60, 64, 65, 75, 76, and 77, covering Physical Layer and Media Access Control sublayer of 1G-EPON and 10G-EPON interfaces.

Cl 7 SC 7.2.1.1 P78 L25 # 331  
 Powell, Bill Nokia  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D  
 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."  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
 Comment type changed from E to T  
 The following text highlights changes  
 "Individual branches of the PON are terminated with the Optical Line Terminal (OLT) in the Central Office<new> or at remote optical nodes,</new> and Optical Network Units (ONUs) near the subscribers."

Cl 7 SC 7.2.1.2 P80 L13 # 220  
 Graber, Steffen Pepperl+Fuchs GmbH  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket  
 ... and it is connected to media dependent interface ... (add 'a' after 'to')  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 ... and it is connected to a media dependent interface ...  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 7 SC 7.2.1.3 P81 L21 # 261  
 B, A C  
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D bucket  
 missing article  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 change "to upstream" to "to the upstream"  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

## Proposed Responses

## IEEE P802.3cf D2.0 YANG Data Model Definitions Initial Working Group ballot comments

Cl 7 SC 7.2.1.3 P81 L21 # 221  
 Graber, Steffen Pepperl+Fuchs GmbH  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket  
 Access to upstream channel .. (add 'the' after 'to')  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Access to the upstream channel ...  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
 See comment #261

Cl 7 SC 7.2.1.6 P82 L55 # 262  
 B, A C  
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D bucket  
 missing article  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 change "provides mechanism" to "provides a mechanism"  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 7 SC 7.2.1.6 P83 L3 # 222  
 Graber, Steffen Pepperl+Fuchs GmbH  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket  
 ... slave devices to master device clock. (add 'the' after 'to')  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 ... slave devices to the master device clock.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 7 SC 7.2.1.6 P83 L6 # 223  
 Graber, Steffen Pepperl+Fuchs GmbH  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket  
 ... does not overlap. (replace 'does' by 'do')  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 ... do not overlap.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 7 SC 7.2.1.7 P84 L1 # 332  
 Powell, Bill Nokia  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D 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.

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
 Test with highlighted text  
 "The <remove>optional </remove>FEC mechanism <new>is optional for 1G EPON but is mandatory for 10G EPON, and is </new> defined to enhance the EPON link budget"

Cl 7 SC 7.2.2 P85 L61 # 224  
 Graber, Steffen Pepperl+Fuchs GmbH  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket  
 Each row in the tables are indexed ... (replace 'are' by 'is')  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Each row in the tables is indexed ...  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Proposed Responses

IEEE P802.3cf D2.0 YANG Data Model Definitions Initial Working Group ballot comments

Cl 7 SC 7.3.2 P89 L3 # 267  
 Lapak, Jeff UNH-IOL

Comment Type T Comment Status D

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."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 7 SC 7.3.2 P89 L32 # 327  
 Remein, Duane Huawei

Comment Type T Comment Status D

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

SuggestedRemedy

Replace with:

Logical Link Identifiers (LLIDs) are used to identify 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.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Comment type was changed from E to T

Use the following description

Logical Link Identifiers (LLIDs) are used to identify 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 P95 L52 # 323  
 Remein, Duane Huawei

Comment Type E Comment Status D 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

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

## Proposed Responses

## IEEE P802.3cf D2.0 YANG Data Model Definitions Initial Working Group ballot comments

**Cl 7**    **SC 7.3.2**                      **P96**            **L48**            # **324**  
 Remein, Duane                              Huawei  
**Comment Type**    **E**            **Comment Status**    **D**                              *bucket*  
 Indenting is inconsistent with the rest of the document.  
**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Indent entire description as elsewhere in document.  
**Proposed Response**                      **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Cl 7**    **SC 7.3.2**                      **P133**            **L32**            # **325**  
 Remein, Duane                              Huawei  
**Comment Type**    **E**            **Comment Status**    **D**                              *bucket*  
 Same issue pg 134 line 13  
**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Move the quote marks to beginning of description text (i.e., to read "This object ...") and indent the description as is typical in the doc. Ensure individual lines are not excessively long (~60 characters excluding indent)  
**Proposed Response**                      **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Cl 8**    **SC 8.1**                              **P142**            **L7**                # **357**  
 Trowbridge, Steve                              Nokia  
**Comment Type**    **E**            **Comment Status**    **D**                              *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  
**Proposed Response**                      **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 See comment #248

**Cl 8**    **SC 8.1**                              **P143**            **L7**                # **248**  
 Winkel, Ludwig                              Siemens AG  
**Comment Type**    **T**            **Comment Status**    **D**                              *802-3-ah*  
 Don't mention a committee that did something. Describe it more neutral.  
**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Change to: "The Amendment IEEE 802.3ah with the title Ethernet in the First Mile (EFM) contains management capabilities to .."  
**Proposed Response**                      **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change to: "IEEE Std 802.3ah (now part of IEEE Std 802.3) added management capabilities to .."

**Cl 8**    **SC 8.4**                              **P146**            **L14**              # **310**  
 Cheng, Weiyong                              Coriant  
**Comment Type**    **TR**            **Comment Status**    **D**  
 Why operational-status is W/R, should it be RO? RFC4878 also has it RO  
**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Replace W/R with RO  
**Proposed Response**                      **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Cl 8**    **SC 8.5.1**                              **P150**            **L18**              # **311**  
 Cheng, Weiyong                              Coriant  
**Comment Type**    **TR**            **Comment Status**    **D**  
 unit32 is used for the type of statistics, 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'  
**Proposed Response**                      **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED REJECT.

Original objects in Clause 30 were using 32-bit representation. It is expected that YANG will provide the same behavior, hence the use of the same sized counters.

**Cl 8**      **SC 8.5.2**                      **P152**              **L62**              # **367**  
Trowbridge, Steve                              Nokia

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

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.

**Proposed Response**              **Response Status**    **W**  
PROPOSED REJECT.

This is a recommendation and not a requirement. Furthermore, for Link OAM to work, it needs to be tied to ethernet interface - otherwise, it does not have proper context to work on.

**Cl 8**      **SC 8.5.2**                      **P153**              **L44**              # **344**  
Trowbridge, Steve                              Nokia

**Comment Type**    **T**                      **Comment Status**    **D**

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.

**Proposed Response**              **Response Status**    **W**  
PROPOSED REJECT.

No specific changes are proposed.

**Cl 8**      **SC 8.5.2**                      **P153**              **L52**              # **345**  
Trowbridge, Steve                              Nokia

**Comment Type**    **T**                      **Comment Status**    **D**

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.

**Proposed Response**              **Response Status**    **W**  
PROPOSED REJECT.

No specific changes are proposed.

**Cl 8**      **SC 8.5.2**                      **P154**              **L4**              # **346**  
Trowbridge, Steve                              Nokia

**Comment Type**    **T**                      **Comment Status**    **D**

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.

**Proposed Response**              **Response Status**    **W**  
PROPOSED REJECT.

No specific changes are proposed.

Cl 8 SC 8.5.2 P158 L53 # 347  
Trowbridge, Steve Nokia

Comment Type T Comment Status D

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 'unidirectional-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.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Remove grouping 'intf-config'

Cl 8 SC 8.5.2 P159 L29 # 312  
Cheng, Weiyang Coriant

Comment Type T Comment Status D

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

*SuggestedRemedy*

Replace 'udlf' with 'unidirectional-link-fault'

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Comment type was changed from E to T

Cl 8 SC 8.5.2 P161 L26 # 348  
Trowbridge, Steve Nokia

Comment Type T Comment Status D

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.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 8 SC 8.5.2 P161 L26 # 359  
Trowbridge, Steve Nokia

Comment Type T Comment Status D

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.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 8 SC 8.5.2 P161 L55 # 360  
Trowbridge, Steve Nokia

Comment Type T Comment Status D

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.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

Lack of specific suggested changes.

**Cl 8**      **SC 8.5.2**                      **P166**              **L26**              # **361**  
 Trowbridge, Steve                      Nokia

**Comment Type T**              **Comment Status D**

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?

**Proposed Response**              **Response Status W**

PROPOSED REJECT.

Lack of specific suggested changes.

**Cl 8**      **SC 8.5.2**                      **P166**              **L32**              # **362**  
 Trowbridge, Steve                      Nokia

**Comment Type T**              **Comment Status D**

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?

**Proposed Response**              **Response Status W**

PROPOSED REJECT.

Lack of specific suggested changes.

**Cl 8**      **SC 8.5.2**                      **P168**              **L34**              # **363**  
 Trowbridge, Steve                      Nokia

**Comment Type T**              **Comment Status D**

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?

**Proposed Response**              **Response Status W**

PROPOSED REJECT.

Lack of specific suggested changes.

**Cl 8**      **SC 8.5.2**                      **P168**              **L50**              # **364**  
 Trowbridge, Steve                      Nokia

**Comment Type T**              **Comment Status D**

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.

**Proposed Response**              **Response Status W**

PROPOSED REJECT.

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

**Cl 8**      **SC 8.5.2**                      **P169**              **L23**              # **365**  
 Trowbridge, Steve                      Nokia

**Comment Type T**              **Comment Status D**

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

**SuggestedRemedy**

Add a proper if-feature statement.

**Proposed Response**              **Response Status W**

PROPOSED REJECT.

Lack of specific suggested changes.

**Cl 8**      **SC 8.5.2**                      **P170**              **L28**              # **366**  
Trowbridge, Steve                      Nokia

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

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)

*Proposed Response*              **Response Status**    **W**  
PROPOSED REJECT.

Separate module is more extensible

**Cl 8**      **SC 8.5.2**                      **P170**              **L57**              # **368**  
Trowbridge, Steve                      Nokia

**Comment Type**    **T**                      **Comment Status**    **D**

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.

*Proposed Response*              **Response Status**    **W**  
PROPOSED REJECT.

Lack of specific suggested changes.

**Cl 8**      **SC 8.5.2**                      **P171**              **L41**              # **369**  
Trowbridge, Steve                      Nokia

**Comment Type**    **T**                      **Comment Status**    **D**

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't 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.

*Proposed Response*              **Response Status**    **W**  
PROPOSED REJECT.

Lack of specific suggested changes.

**Cl 8**      **SC 8.5.2**                      **P171**              **L41**              # **370**  
Trowbridge, Steve                      Nokia

**Comment Type**    **T**                      **Comment Status**    **D**

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.

*Proposed Response*              **Response Status**    **W**  
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

## Proposed Responses

## IEEE P802.3cf D2.0 YANG Data Model Definitions Initial Working Group ballot comments

**Cl 8**    **SC 8.5.2**    **P172**    **L54**    # **371**  
 Trowbridge, Steve    Nokia

**Comment Type**    **T**    **Comment Status**    **D**

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 procedure 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.

**Proposed Response**    **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED REJECT.

Lack of specific suggested changes.

**Cl 8**    **SC 8.5.2**    **P173**    **L3**    # **313**  
 Cheng, Weiying    Coriant

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

Is any reason to comment PRC out and remove them in future? Reset stats is a useful for operator so suggest to keep this functon.

*SuggestedRemedy*  
 keep RPCs for reset stats

**Proposed Response**    **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED REJECT.

PRC are considered vendor-specific.

**Cl 8**    **SC 8.5.2**    **P173**    **L7**    # **349**  
 Trowbridge, Steve    Nokia

**Comment Type**    **T**    **Comment Status**    **D**

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.

**Proposed Response**    **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED REJECT.

Lack of specific suggested changes.

**Cl 8**    **SC 8.5.2**    **P173**    **L24**    # **350**  
 Trowbridge, Steve    Nokia

**Comment Type**    **T**    **Comment Status**    **D**

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.

**Proposed Response**    **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED REJECT.

Lack of specific suggested changes.

**Cl 8**    **SC 8.5.2**    **P174**    **L18**    # **351**  
 Trowbridge, Steve    Nokia

**Comment Type**    **T**    **Comment Status**    **D**

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.

**Proposed Response**    **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED REJECT.

Lack of specific suggested changes.

**Cl 8**    **SC 8.5.2**    **P174**    **L38**    # **352**  
 Trowbridge, Steve    Nokia

**Comment Type**    **T**    **Comment Status**    **D**

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.

**Proposed Response**    **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED REJECT.

Lack of specific suggested changes.

Proposed Responses

IEEE P802.3cf D2.0 YANG Data Model Definitions Initial Working Group ballot comments

Cl **8** SC **8.5.3** P**166** L**54** # **326**  
 Remein, Duane Huawei

Comment Type **E** Comment Status **D** bucket

Odd way to end a description <<P> ";"  
 Same issue pg 167 line 24. Other locations may exist but are difficult to locate in pdf, might be easier to locate 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.

Proposed Response Response Status **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **802** SC **802.3cf** P**23** L**28** # **380**  
 Jethanandani, Mahesh Xoriant

Comment Type **ER** Comment Status **D** 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)

Proposed Response Response Status **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #382

Cl **Content** SC **Contents** P**13** L**1** # **215**  
 Graber, Steffen Pepperl+Fuchs GmbH

Comment Type **E** Comment Status **D** bucket

Page numbers 10 to 12 are missing.

SuggestedRemedy

Correct page numbering.

Proposed Response Response Status **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.