Cl **FM**   *SC* **FM**   *P* **1**   *L* **1**   # i-18

Anslow, Peter   Ciena Corporation

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

"IEEE P802.3.2(TM)/D2.1" should be "IEEE P802.3.2(TM)/D3.0"

SuggestedRemedy

replace "D2.1" with the draft number text inset.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **FM**   *SC* **FM**   *P* **2**   *L* **1**   # i-19

Anslow, Peter   Ciena Corporation

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

The even page header in the front matter is for P802.3cc

SuggestedRemedy

Make consistent with the other headers.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **FM**   *SC* **FM**   *P* **7**   *L* **21**   # i-20

Anslow, Peter   Ciena Corporation

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

The column sizes in the list of WG ballot participants need changing to avoid any names wrapping across two lines.

SuggestedRemedy

Re-size the columns to be the same as the latest version of the 802.3 FrameMaker template.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **FM**   *SC* **FM**   *P* **8**   *L* **2**   # i-21

Anslow, Peter   Ciena Corporation

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

The first 6 names on page 8 are repeats of names on page 7.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove "McMillan, Larry" through "Miguelez, Phil" from the list on page 8

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **FM**   *SC* **FM**   *P* **10**   *L* **1**   # i-22

Anslow, Peter   Ciena Corporation

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

The heading for "Introduction" is missing.

SuggestedRemedy

Add the heading

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **FM**   *SC* **FM**   *P* **10**   *L* **1**   # i-116

Grow, Robert   RMG Consulting

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

The title "Introduction" is missing.

SuggestedRemedy

Please restore the title. (If necessary, get the templates fixed.)

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

Cl **FM**
SC **FM**

Page 1 of 45
10/18/2018 10:18:13 PM

Cl **FM**   *SC* **FM**   *P* **10**   *L* **6**   # i-117

Grow, Robert   RMG Consulting

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

The introduction is too terse.

SuggestedRemedy

In consultation with the WG Chair, modify to make the Introdution more helpful. Something more on the lines of IEEE Std 802.3.1 would be good The Introduction should describe better the base document(s) used for this standard. (With the approval of P802.3bt, and IEEE Std 802.3bt-2918 by definition becoming part of IEEE Std 802.3-2018, this is very important.)   and include some description of the parts of Std 802.3 management included in this standard. This standard will likely be IEEE Std 802.3.2-2019, but there should be two 802.3 amendments dated 2018, therefore, the introduction should be clear on whether this standard includes capabilities associated with amendments to 802.3-2018. It also should address that capabilities are based on Clause 30 and IETF defined management attributes.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **FM**   *SC* **FM**   *P* **10**   *L* **7**   # i-118

Grow, Robert   RMG Consulting

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

The 2018 revision has been published.

SuggestedRemedy

The Introduction should reference IEEE Std 802.3-2018 (not 201X).

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **FM**   *SC* **FM**   *P* **10**   *L* **8**   # i-119

Grow, Robert   RMG Consulting

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

Grammar.

SuggestedRemedy

"results" should be "result"

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **0**   *SC* **0**   *P*   *L*   # i-27

Perry, Lisa

Comment Type **G**   *Comment Status* **X**

This draft meets all editorial requirements.

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

Cl **0**
SC **0**

Page 2 of 45
10/18/2018 10:18:13 PM

Cl **1**   *SC* **1**   *P* **1**   *L* **1**   # i-244
Mansfield, Scott

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

Please change "ethernet" to "dot3" in the names of all P802.3.2 related modules (module name, namespace, and file name)

SuggestedRemedy

For example:
ieee802-ethernet-interface.yang
to
ieee802-dot3-interface.yang

Another example:

module ieee802-ethernet-interface {
  yang-version 1.1;

  namespace
    "urn:ieee:std:802.3:yang:ieee802-ethernet-interface";

To

module ieee802-dot3-interface {
  yang-version 1.1;

  namespace
    "urn:ieee:std:802.3:yang:ieee802-dot3-interface";

Please complete for:
ieee802-ethernet-interface-half-duplex.yang
ieee802-ethernet-interface.yang
ieee802-ethernet-link-oam.yang
ieee802-ethernet-pon.yang
ieee802-ethernet-pse.yang

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **1**   *SC* **1**   *P* **14**   *L* **4**   # i-120
Grow, Robert   RMG Consulting

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

The use of an undated reference (i.e., IEEE Std 802.3) indicates the current version of the reference. Today, this reference includes approved P802.3bt, approved P802.3cb, and by completion should include at a minimum P802.3cd. This standard clearly can't track a moving target. A dated reference should be used, and clarity should be added on what parts of IEEE Std 802.3-2018 are not included. It appears that the current approved amendments are not included. It would also be appropriate to indicate that the YANG modules do not include all cmanagement capabilities for DTE specified in Clause 30.

SuggestedRemedy

Add appropriate words about this standard incorporating selected management capabilities for some DTEs defined in IEEE Std 802.3-2018.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **1**   *SC* **1**   *P* **14**   *L* **6**   # i-121
Grow, Robert   RMG Consulting

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

Inconsistent capitalization of Multipoint Control Protocol (though Std 802.3 is not consistent, this capitalization is most common).

SuggestedRemedy

Change this instance.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

Cl **1**
SC **1**

Page 3 of 45
10/18/2018 10:18:13 PM

Cl **1**   *SC* **1.3**   *P* **14**   *L* **26**   # i-140
Cummings, Rodney   National Instruments C

Comment Type **GR**   *Comment Status* **X**

"https://github.com/YangModels/yang/tree/master/standard/ieee/802.3/draft" is not the correct URL, because once 802.3.2 publishes, its YANG module will no longer be a draft.

According to the most recent decision in the IEEE 802 YANGsters group:
   https://1.ieee802.org/yangsters/yangsters-guidelines/yangsters-repository-guidelines/

the location would be
"https://github.com/YangModels/yang/tree/master/standard/ieee/802.3/published"

SuggestedRemedy

Coordinate with IEEE 802 YANGsters to determine the correct GitHub location for published IEEE working group YANG modules.

If for some reason that coordination fails, use
"https://github.com/YangModels/yang/tree/master/standard/ieee/802.3/published"

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **1**   *SC* **1.4**   *P* **14**   *L* **44**   # i-31
Remein, Duane   Huawei Technologies

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

It would be better if we did not restrict the higher protocol to just NETCONF and RESTCONF as in the following statement: 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).
Same issue pg 17 line 10.

SuggestedRemedy

Change:
"NETCONF (see IETF RFC 6241) and RESTCONF (see IETF RFC 8040)" to
"NETCONF (see IETF RFC 6241) or RESTCONF (see IETF RFC 8040)"

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **1**   *SC* **1.5**   *P* **14**   *L* **51**   # i-32
Remein, Duane   Huawei Technologies

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

There are multiple modules.

SuggestedRemedy

Change:
"The YANG module defined ..." to
"The YANG modules defined ..."

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **1**   *SC* **1.5**   *P* **14**   *L* **63**   # i-33
Remein, Duane   Huawei Technologies

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

There are multiple modules.
The same issue exists on pg 15 line 4 and 9

SuggestedRemedy

Change:
"this YANG module ..." to
"these YANG modules ..."

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **1**   *SC* **1.6**   *P* **15**   *L* **14**   # i-122
Grow, Robert   RMG Consulting

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

The title Conformance does not use the word in the context typically used in 802.3 nor in the IEEE frontmatter boilerplate text.

SuggestedRemedy

Consider changing to "Syntax validation".

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

Cl **1**
SC **1.6**

Page 4 of 45
10/18/2018 10:18:13 PM

Cl **1**   *SC* **1.6**   *P* **15**   *L* **18**   # i-34
Remein, Duane   Huawei Technologies

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

It would be good to provide an exhaustive list of tools and their editions/version used to validate the modules to allow recreation of the environment under which the modules were developed.

SuggestedRemedy

List all validation tools used and their version/edition.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **2**   *SC* **2**   *P* **16**   *L* **9**   # i-139
Grow, Robert   RMG Consulting

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

There is no reference to IEEE Std 802.1 which is referenced in the modules. There is no reference to IEEE Std 802d, which specifies the use of the IEEE branch of the URN arcs.

SuggestedRemedy

Add references.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **2**   *SC* **2**   *P* **16**   *L* **13**   # i-1
Hajduczenia, Marek   Charter Communicatio

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

An editorial note can be removed. Also, fix the publication date for 802.3-2018 to read 31 August 2018

SuggestedRemedy

Per comment

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **2**   *SC* **2**   *P* **16**   *L* **13**   # i-123
Grow, Robert   RMG Consulting

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

The Editorial Note is no longer relevant

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the note.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **2**   *SC* **2**   *P* **16**   *L* **13**   # i-35
Remein, Duane   Huawei Technologies

Comment Type **ER**   *Comment Status* **X**

It is highly unlikely that the edition of 802.3 will change from that referenced and P802.3cj has completed it's work.

SuggestedRemedy

remove the Ed Note.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **2**   *SC* **2**   *P* **16**   *L* **28**   # i-36
Remein, Duane   Huawei Technologies

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

RFC 3621
Is IETF IETF RFC 3621, Power Ethernet MIB, A. Berger, December 2003 still in force or has it been superseded by 802.3.1 2013? If superseded it should not be referenced or noted as obsolete.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the outdated ref.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general   *Cl* **2**   Page 5 of 45
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn   *SC* **2**   10/18/2018 10:18:13 PM
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

Cl **2**	*SC* **2**	*P* **16**	*L* **30**	#	i-127

Grow, Robert   RMG Consulting

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

With the addition of Table 5-2, RFC 3635, EtherLike MIB should be added to the normative references.

SuggestedRemedy

Add reference.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **2**	*SC* **2**	*P* **16**	*L* **31**	#	i-37

Remein, Duane   Huawei Technologies

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

RFC 5246
Per https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/rfc8446/ RFC 5246 is obsolete.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace with RFC 8446

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **2**	*SC* **2**	*P* **16**	*L* **39**	#	i-38

Remein, Duane   Huawei Technologies

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

RFC 6241
Per https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/rfc8446/ RFC 6241 has been updated by RFC 7803

SuggestedRemedy

Add ref to RFC 7803

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **2**	*SC* **2**	*P* **16**	*L* **46**	#	i-39

Remein, Duane   Huawei Technologies

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

RFC 6536
Per https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/rfc6536/ RFC 6536 is obsolete.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace with RFC 8341

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **2**	*SC* **2**	*P* **16**	*L* **55**	#	i-40

Remein, Duane   Huawei Technologies

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

RFC 7950
Per https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/rfc7950/ RFC 7950 has been updated.

SuggestedRemedy

Add ref to RFC 8342

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **3**	*SC* **3**	*P* **17**	*L* **5**	#	i-124

Grow, Robert   RMG Consulting

Comment Type **ER**   *Comment Status* **X**

A number of terms used in the document are defined in Std 802.3. Can we modify the header text (e.g., add a sentence or a new paragraph or a NOTE) to describe this?

SuggestedRemedy

Some terms used in this document are defined in IEEE Std 802.3, and where alternative definitions occur in the IEEE Standards Dictionary, the IEEE 802.3 definition should be used.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

Cl **3**
SC **3**

Page 6 of 45
10/18/2018 10:18:13 PM

Cl **3**   *SC* **3.1**   *P* **17**   *L* **7**   # i-41
Remein, Duane   Huawei Technologies

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **X**
   missing period at end of sentence.

SuggestedRemedy
   per comment

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **4**   *SC* **4**   *P* **18**   *L* **5**   # i-125
Grow, Robert   RMG Consulting

Comment Type **ER**   *Comment Status* **X**
   A large number of acronyms are used in the document but not included here. The
   recommended list of additions includes acronyms with multiple uses and at least one use
   not being expanded.

SuggestedRemedy
   CSMA/CD carrier sense multiple access with collision detection (note this one isn't
   included in Std 802.3 acronymns)
   DTE   data terminal equipment
   EPON Ethernet passive optical networks (though all uses found are in clause 7, the
   number of uses justifies inclusion)
   IEEE   Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers
   IETF   Internet Engineering Task Force
   NETCONF Network Configuration Protocol
   PoE   Power over Ethernet
   RESTCONF ???? (not expanded in the normative reference title)

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **5**   *SC* **5.1**   *P* **19**   *L* **14**   # i-141
Cummings, Rodney   National Instruments C

Comment Type **GR**   *Comment Status* **X**
   It is unclear whether these two sentences are intended to be normative.
   If yes, "shall" "should" or "may" is needed.
   If yes, it would be acceptable to state that the listed attributes (name, description,etc)
   "shall" be supported.
   If yes, it would not be acceptable to state that "Other attributes shall not be supported".
   Other attributes include oper-status, which is essential to use of an interface. Without oper-
   status, it is impossible to determine if an interface is up or down (because admin-status
   does not tell you that).

   The Proposed Change assumes that the answer is no, and therefore this standard cannot
   make a statement regarding other attributes.

SuggestedRemedy
   Replace the two sentences with "This standard does not have a normative requirement for
   data nodes of the base ietf-interfaces YANG module, but the following data nodes are
   expected to be supported: name, description, type, enabled, admin-status, oper-status, if-
   index, and phys-address."

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **5**   *SC* **5.2**   *P* **19**   *L* **49**   # i-42
Remein, Duane   Huawei Technologies

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **X**
   The Editorial Note seems to be conveying information that would be useful to the reader
   which should be retained in the published document. Furthermore there is no reference to
   Table 5-3.

SuggestedRemedy
   Remove the Editorial Note and add the following at the end of the para in 5.2.
   Nodes that do not map into RFC 2819 (RMON) but into the ETHERLIKE MIB appear in
   Table 5-3.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general   *Cl* **5**   Page 7 of 45
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn   *SC* **5.2**   10/18/2018 10:18:13 PM
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

Cl **5**   *SC* **5.2**   *P* **19**   *L* **50**   # i-2

Hajduczenia, Marek   Charter Communicatio

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

Unnecessary editorial note

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the note on line 50-52.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **5**   *SC* **5.2**   *P* **20**   *L* **24**   # i-231

Weber, Karl   Beckhoff Automation

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

speed is m/s according to SI units

SuggestedRemedy

Change to data rate

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **5**   *SC* **5.2**   *P* **21**   *L* **45**   # i-23

Anslow, Peter   Ciena Corporation

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

The final bottom border in Table 5-1 should be "Thin" i.e., follow the table definition.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the override from the final bottom border in Table 5-1

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **5**   *SC* **5.2**   *P* **22**   *L* **19**   # i-126

Grow, Robert   RMG Consulting

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

The titles of Table 5-2 and 5-3 are inconsistent. One uses the RFC (RFC 2819, RMON)
and the other the common name (RFC 3635 EtherLike MIB).

SuggestedRemedy

Make consistent, prefferably using RFC #.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **5**   *SC* **5.3.1**   *P* **24**   *L* **19**   # i-232

Weber, Karl   Beckhoff Automation

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

speed is m/s according to SI units

SuggestedRemedy

Change to data rate

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **5**   *SC* **5.3.2**   *P* **26**   *L* **3**   # i-43

Remein, Duane   Huawei Technologies

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

The sub-clause refers to multiple YANG modules.

SuggestedRemedy

Change:
"In the following YANG module definition, ..." to
"In the following YANG module definitions, ..."

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general   *Cl* **5**   Page 8 of 45
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn   *SC* **5.3.2**   10/18/2018 10:18:13 PM
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

Cl **5**   *SC* **5.3.2**   *P* **26**   *L* **3**   # i-44

Remein, Duane   Huawei Technologies

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

This para, and those similar to it in 6.5.2 pg 54 line 3, ,7.4.2 pg 79 line 3, and 8.5.2 pg 130 line 3, is extremely confusing due to multiple circular references to 5.2, 5.3 and "this clause" (presumably Clause 5).
"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 and mappings in 5.3 shall take precedence."
What is "DESCRIPTION text" referring to? I can find no other occurrence of ""DESCRIPTION" except in these four paras. If it is referring to text following the YANG attribute "description" then the references to "corresponding definition in 5.2 through 5.3" and "definitions and mappings in 5.3" do not make sense given that the YANG attribute "description" is part of sub-clause 5.3.

SuggestedRemedy

If "DESCRIPTION text" refers to one or more of the ~478 instances of the YANG attribute "description" in the module itself then:
Change:
"DESCRIPTION text and the corresponding definition in 5.2 through 5.3 of this clause occur, the definitions and mappings in 5.3 shall take precedence." to:
"YANG description attributes in 5.3.2.1 or 5.3.2.2 and the corresponding mappings in 5.2 and tree hierarchy in 5.3.1 occur, the definitions in the YANG code in 5.3.2.1 and 5.3.2.2 shall take precedence."
italicize description in the above change.

Make similar changes in 6.5.2, 7.4.2, and 8.5.2.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **5**   *SC* **5.3.2**   *P* **26**   *L* **9**   # i-142

Cummings, Rodney   National Instruments C

Comment Type **GR**   *Comment Status* **X**

"https://github.com/YangModels/yang/tree/master/standard/ieee/802.3/draft" is not the correct URL, because once 802.3.2 publishes, its YANG module will no longer be a draft.

According to the most recent decision in the IEEE 802 YANGsters group:
   https://1.ieee802.org/yangsters/yangsters-guidelines/yangsters-repository-guidelines/

the location would be
"https://github.com/YangModels/yang/tree/master/standard/ieee/802.3/published"

SuggestedRemedy

Coordinate with IEEE 802 YANGsters to determine the correct GitHub location for published IEEE working group YANG modules.

If for some reason that coordination fails, use
"https://github.com/YangModels/yang/tree/master/standard/ieee/802.3/published"

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **5**   *SC* **5.3.2**   *P* **27**   *L* **10**   # i-233

Weber, Karl   Beckhoff Automation

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

speed is m/s according to SI units

SuggestedRemedy

Change to data rate

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **5**   *SC* **5.3.2**   *P* **27**   *L* **17**   # i-234

Weber, Karl   Beckhoff Automation

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

speed is m/s according to SI units

SuggestedRemedy

Change to data rate

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

Cl **5**
SC **5.3.2**

Page 9 of 45
10/18/2018 10:18:13 PM

Cl **5**	*SC* **5.3.2**	*P* **30**	*L* **48**	# i-235

Weber, Karl   Beckhoff Automation

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **X**
   speed is m/s according to SI units

SuggestedRemedy
   Change to data rate

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **5**	*SC* **5.3.2**	*P* **30**	*L* **49**	# i-236

Weber, Karl   Beckhoff Automation

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **X**
   speed is m/s according to SI units

SuggestedRemedy
   Change to data rate

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **5**	*SC* **5.3.2**	*P* **30**	*L* **53**	# i-237

Weber, Karl   Beckhoff Automation

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **X**
   speed is m/s according to SI units

SuggestedRemedy
   Change to data rate

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **5**	*SC* **5.3.2**	*P* **44**	*L* **49**	# i-238

Weber, Karl   Beckhoff Automation

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **X**
   speed is m/s according to SI units

SuggestedRemedy
   Change to data rate

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **5**	*SC* **5.3.2**	*P* **45**	*L* **7**	# i-239

Weber, Karl   Beckhoff Automation

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **X**
   speed is m/s according to SI units

SuggestedRemedy
   Change to data rate

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **5**	*SC* **5.3.2**	*P* **45**	*L* **37**	# i-241

Weber, Karl   Beckhoff Automation

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **X**
   speed is m/s according to SI units

SuggestedRemedy
   Change to data rate

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **5**	*SC* **5.3.2**	*P* **45**	*L* **38**	# i-243

Weber, Karl   Beckhoff Automation

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **X**
   speed is m/s according to SI units

SuggestedRemedy
   Change to data rate

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **5**	*SC* **5.3.2**	*P* **46**	*L* **4**	# i-240

Weber, Karl   Beckhoff Automation

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **X**
   speed is m/s according to SI units

SuggestedRemedy
   Change to data rate

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

Cl **5**
SC **5.3.2**

Page 10 of 45
10/18/2018 10:18:13 PM

Cl **5** *SC* **5.3.2** *P* **46** *L* **46** # i-242

Weber, Karl Beckhoff Automation

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

speed is m/s according to SI units

SuggestedRemedy

Change to data rate

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **5** *SC* **5.3.2.1** *P* *L* **60** # i-167

Weber, Karl Beckhoff Automation

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

Counts octets but FCS seems to be bytes

SuggestedRemedy

Change byte to octet

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **5** *SC* **5.3.2.1** *P* **26** *L* **14** # i-45

Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies

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

What is meant by "Revision entry" and "date of last revisions"? These terms do not appear in the module itself.
Same issue 5.3.2.2 Pg 43 line 47, 6.5.2 pg 54 line 11, ,7.4.2 pg 79 line 11, and 8.5.2 pg 130 line 11

SuggestedRemedy

Clarify which attributes in the YANG module are being referred to.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **5** *SC* **5.3.2.1** *P* **26** *L* **44** # i-3

Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communicatio

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

iana-if-type reference is outdated + this module is maintained by IANA itself and published on their website. Right now, we are pointing to Git location, which is nothing more than a symbolink reference to iana-if-type@2017-01-19.yang module published on IANA website. We can make a direct reference to latest version instead.

SuggestedRemedy

Change

reference "https://github.com/YangModels/yang/blob/master/ standard/ietf/RFC/iana-if-type.yang";

to

reference "http://www.iana.org/assignments/yang-parameters/iana-if-type@2018-07- 03.yang";

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **5** *SC* **5.3.2.1** *P* **26** *L* **56** # i-46

Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies

Comment Type **GR** *Comment Status* **X**

This contact URL will become obsolete when the project finishes. It should ref the 802.3 Working Group not the project.

SuggestedRemedy

Globally change "Web URL: http://www.ieee802.org/3/cf/" to "Web URL: http://www.ieee802.org/3/"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **5** *SC* **5.3.2.1** *P* **27** *L* **10** # i-158

Weber, Karl Beckhoff Automation

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

speed-type is not the appropriate term (speed should mean "data rate")

SuggestedRemedy

Replace this parameter by "phy-type" according to IEEE 802.3 30.3.2.1.2

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

Cl **5**
SC **5.3.2.1**

Page 11 of 45
10/18/2018 10:18:13 PM

Cl **5**   *SC* **5.3.2.1**   *P* **28**   *L* **57**   # i-4

Hajduczenia, Marek   Charter Communicatio

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

No need to use the reference to 802.3 anymore, it is clearly defined that any "Ethernet interface" is an IEEE Std 802.3 compliant Ethernet interface

SuggestedRemedy

Change "IEEE Std 802.3 Ethernet interface" to "Ethernet interface" in following locations (page/line):
28/57
32/39
44/31

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **5**   *SC* **5.3.2.1**   *P* **31**   *L* **24**   # i-159

Weber, Karl   Beckhoff Automation

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

frames is not an unit according to the International System of Units see
https://www.bipm.org/utils/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf

SuggestedRemedy

Delete units - line

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **5**   *SC* **5.3.2.1**   *P* **31**   *L* **46**   # i-160

Weber, Karl   Beckhoff Automation

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

frames is not an unit according to the International System of Units see
https://www.bipm.org/utils/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf

SuggestedRemedy

Delete units - line

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **5**   *SC* **5.3.2.1**   *P* **32**   *L* **3**   # i-28

Zhuang, Yan   Huawei Technologies

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

There is no such thing as "Priority-based PAUSE frame". It is called "PFC frame".

Word "will" shall not be used.

I cannot understand the intended meaning of the following text: "If explicitly configured, when auto-negotiated is enabled, then the configuration will restrict the priority PAUSE frame based flow control settings that
can be negotiated. The default value is implementation-dependent."

--from Glen Kramer

SuggestedRemedy

Replace description
"IEEE Std 802.3 Priority-based PAUSE frame based flow control." with "IEEE Std 802.3 Priority-based flow control."

Use the following leaf enable description:
"True indicates that IEEE Std 802.3 priority-based flow control is enabled, false indicates that IEEE Std 802.3 priority-based flow control is disabled. For interfaces that have auto-negotiation, the priority-based flow control is enabled by default."

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **5**   *SC* **5.3.2.1**   *P* **32**   *L* **46**   # i-161

Weber, Karl   Beckhoff Automation

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

frames is not an unit according to the International System of Units see
https://www.bipm.org/utils/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf

SuggestedRemedy

Delete units - line

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

Cl **5**
SC **5.3.2.1**

Page 12 of 45
10/18/2018 10:18:13 PM

Cl **5**   *SC* **5.3.2.1**   *P* **32**   *L* **56**   # i-47

Remein, Duane   Huawei Technologies

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

Indentation of "(IETF RFC 8343)."; "
Same issue pg 33 line 11.

SuggestedRemedy

align with rest of description

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **5**   *SC* **5.3.2.1**   *P* **32**   *L* **65**   # i-162

Weber, Karl   Beckhoff Automation

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

frames is not an unit according to the International System of Units see
https://www.bipm.org/utils/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf

SuggestedRemedy

Delete units - line

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **5**   *SC* **5.3.2.1**   *P* **33**   *L* **48**   # i-163

Weber, Karl   Beckhoff Automation

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

According to 30.3.1.1.37, Max Frame is a enumerated value

SuggestedRemedy

Change definition to the 4 enumeration values

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **5**   *SC* **5.3.2.1**   *P* **34**   *L* **12**   # i-164

Weber, Karl   Beckhoff Automation

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

fps is written differently compared to Gb/s

SuggestedRemedy

Change to f/s

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **5**   *SC* **5.3.2.1**   *P* **35**   *L* **25**   # i-165

Weber, Karl   Beckhoff Automation

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

frames is not an unit according to the International System of Units see
https://www.bipm.org/utils/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf

SuggestedRemedy

Delete units - line

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **5**   *SC* **5.3.2.1**   *P* **35**   *L* **54**   # i-166

Weber, Karl   Beckhoff Automation

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

octets is not an unit according to the International System of Units see
https://www.bipm.org/utils/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf

SuggestedRemedy

Delete units - line

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general   *Cl* **5**   Page 13 of 45
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn   *SC* **5.3.2.1**   10/18/2018 10:18:13 PM
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

Cl **5**	*SC* **5.3.2.1**	*P* **36**	*L* **10**	#	i-168

Weber, Karl   Beckhoff Automation

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

frames is not an unit according to the International System of Units see
https://www.bipm.org/utils/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf

SuggestedRemedy

Delete units - line

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **5**	*SC* **5.3.2.1**	*P* **36**	*L* **33**	#	i-169

Weber, Karl   Beckhoff Automation

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

frames is not an unit according to the International System of Units see
https://www.bipm.org/utils/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf

SuggestedRemedy

Delete units - line

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **5**	*SC* **5.3.2.1**	*P* **36**	*L* **60**	#	i-170

Weber, Karl   Beckhoff Automation

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

frames is not an unit according to the International System of Units see
https://www.bipm.org/utils/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf

SuggestedRemedy

Delete units - line

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **5**	*SC* **5.3.2.1**	*P* **37**	*L* **21**	#	i-171

Weber, Karl   Beckhoff Automation

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

frames is not an unit according to the International System of Units see
https://www.bipm.org/utils/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf

SuggestedRemedy

Delete units - line

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **5**	*SC* **5.3.2.1**	*P* **37**	*L* **46**	#	i-172

Weber, Karl   Beckhoff Automation

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

frames is not an unit according to the International System of Units see
https://www.bipm.org/utils/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf

SuggestedRemedy

Delete units - line

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **5**	*SC* **5.3.2.1**	*P* **38**	*L* **7**	#	i-173

Weber, Karl   Beckhoff Automation

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

frames is not an unit according to the International System of Units see
https://www.bipm.org/utils/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf

SuggestedRemedy

Delete units - line

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

Cl **5**
SC **5.3.2.1**

Page 14 of 45
10/18/2018 10:18:13 PM

Cl **5**	*SC* **5.3.2.1**	*P* **38**	*L* **30**	# i-174

Weber, Karl   Beckhoff Automation

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

frames is not an unit according to the International System of Units see
https://www.bipm.org/utils/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf

SuggestedRemedy

Delete units - line

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **5**	*SC* **5.3.2.1**	*P* **38**	*L* **64**	# i-175

Weber, Karl   Beckhoff Automation

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

frames is not an unit according to the International System of Units see
https://www.bipm.org/utils/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf

SuggestedRemedy

Delete units - line

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **5**	*SC* **5.3.2.1**	*P* **39**	*L* **17**	# i-176

Weber, Karl   Beckhoff Automation

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

frames is not an unit according to the International System of Units see
https://www.bipm.org/utils/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf

SuggestedRemedy

Delete units - line

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **5**	*SC* **5.3.2.1**	*P* **39**	*L* **40**	# i-177

Weber, Karl   Beckhoff Automation

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

frames is not an unit according to the International System of Units see
https://www.bipm.org/utils/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf

SuggestedRemedy

Delete units - line

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **5**	*SC* **5.3.2.1**	*P* **40**	*L* **37**	# i-178

Weber, Karl   Beckhoff Automation

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

frames is not an unit according to the International System of Units see
https://www.bipm.org/utils/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf

SuggestedRemedy

Delete units - line

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **5**	*SC* **5.3.2.1**	*P* **41**	*L* **1**	# i-179

Weber, Karl   Beckhoff Automation

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

transitions is not an unit according to the International System of Units see
https://www.bipm.org/utils/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf

SuggestedRemedy

Delete units - line

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general   *Cl* **5**   Page 15 of 45
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn   *SC* **5.3.2.1**   10/18/2018 10:18:13 PM
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

Cl **5**   *SC* **5.3.2.1**   *P* **41**   *L* **47**   # i-180

Weber, Karl   Beckhoff Automation

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

transitions is not an unit according to the International System of Units see
https://www.bipm.org/utils/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf

SuggestedRemedy

Delete units - line

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **O**

Cl **5**   *SC* **5.3.2.1**   *P* **42**   *L* **48**   # i-182

Weber, Karl   Beckhoff Automation

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

type is counter64 while the in-discard counter is counter32

SuggestedRemedy

change to counter32

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **O**

Cl **5**   *SC* **5.3.2.1**   *P* **42**   *L* **49**   # i-181

Weber, Karl   Beckhoff Automation

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

frames is not an unit according to the International System of Units see
https://www.bipm.org/utils/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf
in-discard in rfc 8343 has no units definition

SuggestedRemedy

Delete units - line

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **O**

Cl **5**   *SC* **5.3.2.1**   *P* **43**   *L* **6**   # i-183

Weber, Karl   Beckhoff Automation

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

frames is not an unit according to the International System of Units see
https://www.bipm.org/utils/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf

SuggestedRemedy

Delete units - line

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **O**

Cl **5**   *SC* **5.3.2.2**   *P* **45**   *L* **6**   # i-24

Anslow, Peter   Ciena Corporation

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

"10GB/s" should be "10 Gb/s" (add a space and lower case B)

SuggestedRemedy

Change "10GB/s" to "10 Gb/s"

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **O**

Cl **5**   *SC* **5.3.2.2**   *P* **45**   *L* **21**   # i-48

Remein, Duane   Huawei Technologies

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

Indentation of augment statement.

SuggestedRemedy

line 19-20 is Indented by one extra level.

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **O**

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

Cl **5**
SC **5.3.2.2**

Page 16 of 45
10/18/2018 10:18:13 PM

Cl **5**   *SC* **5.3.2.2**   *P* **47**   *L* **22**   # i-184
Weber, Karl   Beckhoff Automation

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status* **X**
frames is not an unit according to the International System of Units see
https://www.bipm.org/utils/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf

SuggestedRemedy
Delete units - line

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **5**   *SC* **5.3.2.2**   *P* **47**   *L* **46**   # i-185
Weber, Karl   Beckhoff Automation

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status* **X**
frames is not an unit according to the International System of Units see
https://www.bipm.org/utils/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf

SuggestedRemedy
Delete units - line

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **5**   *SC* **5.3.2.2**   *P* **48**   *L* **5**   # i-186
Weber, Karl   Beckhoff Automation

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status* **X**
frames is not an unit according to the International System of Units see
https://www.bipm.org/utils/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf

SuggestedRemedy
Delete units - line

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **5**   *SC* **5.3.2.2**   *P* **48**   *L* **25**   # i-187
Weber, Karl   Beckhoff Automation

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status* **X**
collisions is not an unit according to the International System of Units see
https://www.bipm.org/utils/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf

SuggestedRemedy
Delete units - line

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **5**   *SC* **5.3.2.2**   *P* **48**   *L* **49**   # i-188
Weber, Karl   Beckhoff Automation

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status* **X**
errors is not an unit according to the International System of Units see
https://www.bipm.org/utils/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf

SuggestedRemedy
Delete units - line

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **5**   *SC* **5.3.2.2**   *P* **49**   *L* **25**   # i-189
Weber, Karl   Beckhoff Automation

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status* **X**
collisions is not an unit according to the International System of Units see
https://www.bipm.org/utils/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf

SuggestedRemedy
Delete units - line

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general   *Cl* **5**   Page 17 of 45
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn   *SC* **5.3.2.2**   10/18/2018 10:18:13 PM
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

Cl **6** *SC* **6.1**   *P* **50**   *L* **13** # i-49

Remein, Duane   Huawei Technologies

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

Is this a test to see who is paying attention? There is only one data module in this clause and there are 2 in Clause 5.

SuggestedRemedy

Change:
"The YANG modules defined in this clause extend the Ethernetinterface YANG data module defined in Clause 5 ..." to
"The YANG module defined in this clause extends the Ethernetinterface YANG data modules defined in Clause 5..." pointers follow

          ^

^   ^

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **6** *SC* **6.1**   *P* **60**   *L* **15** # i-246

Zimmerman, George

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

Now that 802.3bt is finished, it is worth noting that clause 145 PSEs and management parameters are not covered by YANG. Some changes are obvious (power classes 6 through 8 are no longer PoDL-only). Others may be more subtle. Rather than generating a bunch of work, right now, it is worth specifying that the amendment of 802.3bt are not yet included in this draft.

SuggestedRemedy

Insert "This initial version of IEEE Std 802.3.2 does not include the impact of amendments made to IEEE Std 802.3-2018 by IEEE Std 802.3bt-2018, which was approved while this document was already in Sponsor ballot.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **6** *SC* **6.2**   *P* **50**   *L* **20** # i-50

Remein, Duane   Huawei Technologies

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

missing verb

SuggestedRemedy

Change
"clause focused" to
"clause is focused"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **6** *SC* **6.2**   *P* **50**   *L* **21** # i-51

Remein, Duane   Huawei Technologies

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

missing "the"

SuggestedRemedy

Change:
"Power over Ethernet (PoE) function" to:
"the Power over Ethernet (PoE) function"
and on line 24 change:
"for PoE function" to
"for the PoE function"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **6** *SC* **6.2**   *P* **50**   *L* **22** # i-52

Remein, Duane   Huawei Technologies

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

"power over data line" or "Power over Data Line"? We should be consistent.

SuggestedRemedy

Change: "power over data line" to "Power over Data Line"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general   *Cl* **6**   Page 18 of 45
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn *SC* **6.2**   10/18/2018 10:18:13 PM
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

Cl **6**   *SC* **6.3**   *P* **50**   *L* **12**   # i-129
Grow, Robert   RMG Consulting

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **X**
First use of PD in document not expanded.

SuggestedRemedy
Add expansion Powered Device.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **6**   *SC* **6.3**   *P* **51**   *L* **1**   # i-53
Remein, Duane   Huawei Technologies

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **X**
Why does 6.3 warrant starting on a new page?

SuggestedRemedy
Remove page break

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **6**   *SC* **6.3**   *P* **51**   *L* **1**   # i-128
Grow, Robert   RMG Consulting

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **X**
There is a major issue raised with the approval of P802.3bt and by definition, IEEE Std
802.3bt-201x becoming part of IEEE Std 802.3-2018. Per IEEE style, a reference to IEEE
Std 802.3-2018 includes all approved amendments. One problem for P802.3.2 created by
IEEE Std 802.3bt-201x is addition of "Power over Ethernet" and in some cases
replacement of DTE Power via the MDI with various forms of Power over Ethernet e.g.,
(Power over Ethernet over 2 pairs). This includes changes in clause 30 management.

The draft should specify capabilities consistent with the changes introduced by IEEE Std
802.3bt-201x). (The WG Chair should have a target publication date for the amendment.)

SuggestedRemedy
Replace DTE Power via the MDI terminology to be consistent with the current usage of
Power over Ethernet terms. Add new attributes and enumerations included in IEEE Std
802.3bt-201x.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **6**   *SC* **6.3**   *P* **51**   *L* **5**   # i-54
Remein, Duane   Huawei Technologies

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

SuggestedRemedy
change
"There are a number of data nodes defined in this YANG module as configuration with read-
write." to
"There are a number of data nodes defined in this YANG module that are configurable as
read-write."

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **6**   *SC* **6.3**   *P* **51**   *L* **30**   # i-55
Remein, Duane   Huawei Technologies

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

SuggestedRemedy
Change:
"and possible to encrypt their values" to:
"and to possibly encrypt their values"

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **6**   *SC* **6.5.1**   *P* **60**   *L* **27**   # i-156
Weber, Karl   Beckhoff Automation

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **X**
units definition should be plural and without quoting

SuggestedRemedy
change to millijoules

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

Cl **6**
SC **6.5.1**

Page 19 of 45
10/18/2018 10:18:13 PM

Cl **6**   *SC* **6.5.1**   *P* **60**   *L* **47**   # i-151

Weber, Karl   Beckhoff Automation

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

The units is milliwatt which is different from the description actual-power on Page 64 and the power-accuracy leaf which do not allow to specify sub-milliwatt values

SuggestedRemedy

change type of actual power to integer and units to milliwatts

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **6**   *SC* **6.5.1**   *P* **60**   *L* **47**   # i-152

Weber, Karl   Beckhoff Automation

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

unsigned32 means more than 2 Megawatt maximum power if the unit is milliWatt. This is far more than needed.

SuggestedRemedy

change type of actual power to integer32.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **6**   *SC* **6.5.1**   *P* **60**   *L* **47**   # i-153

Weber, Karl   Beckhoff Automation

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

units definition should be plural and without quoting

SuggestedRemedy

change to milliwatts

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **6**   *SC* **6.5.1**   *P* **60**   *L* **59**   # i-154

Weber, Karl   Beckhoff Automation

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

units definition should be plural and without quoting

SuggestedRemedy

change to milliwatts

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **6**   *SC* **6.5.1**   *P* **60**   *L* **59**   # i-155

Weber, Karl   Beckhoff Automation

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

unsigned32 means more than 2 Megawatt maximum power if the unit is milliWatt. This is far more than needed.

SuggestedRemedy

change type of actual power to integer32.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **6**   *SC* **6.5.1**   *P* **64**   *L* **2**   # i-157

Weber, Karl   Beckhoff Automation

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

units definition missing

SuggestedRemedy

add "units millijoules;"

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general   *Cl* **6**   Page 20 of 45
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn   *SC* **6.5.1**   10/18/2018 10:18:13 PM
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

Cl **6**   *SC* **6.5.1**   *P* **64**   *L* **21**   # i-147

Weber, Karl   Beckhoff Automation

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

unsigned32 means more than 2 Megawatt maximum power if the unit is milliWatt. This is far more than needed.

SuggestedRemedy

change type of actual power to integer32.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **6**   *SC* **6.5.1**   *P* **64**   *L* **21**   # i-148

Weber, Karl   Beckhoff Automation

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

units definition should be plural and without quoting

SuggestedRemedy

change to milliwatts

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **6**   *SC* **6.5.1**   *P* **64**   *L* **21**   # i-146

Weber, Karl   Beckhoff Automation

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

The units is watt which is different from the description actual-power on Page 60 and the power-accuracy leaf which do not allow to specify sub-milliwatt values

SuggestedRemedy

change type of actual power to integer and units to milliwatts

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **6**   *SC* **6.5.1**   *P* **64**   *L* **36**   # i-150

Weber, Karl   Beckhoff Automation

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

unsigned32 means more than 2 Megawatt maximum power if the unit is milliWatt. This is far more than needed.

SuggestedRemedy

change type of actual power to integer32.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **6**   *SC* **6.5.1**   *P* **64**   *L* **36**   # i-149

Weber, Karl   Beckhoff Automation

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

units definition should be plural and without quoting

SuggestedRemedy

change to milliwatts

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **6**   *SC* **6.5.2**   *P* **54**   *L* **9**   # i-143

Cummings, Rodney   National Instruments C

Comment Type **GR**   *Comment Status* **X**

"https://github.com/YangModels/yang/tree/master/standard/ieee/802.3/draft" is not the correct URL, because once 802.3.2 publishes, its YANG module will no longer be a draft.

According to the most recent decision in the IEEE 802 YANGsters group:
  https://1.ieee802.org/yangsters/yangsters-guidelines/yangsters-repository-guidelines/

the location would be
"https://github.com/YangModels/yang/tree/master/standard/ieee/802.3/published"

SuggestedRemedy

Coordinate with IEEE 802 YANGsters to determine the correct GitHub location for published IEEE working group YANG modules.

If for some reason that coordination fails, use
"https://github.com/YangModels/yang/tree/master/standard/ieee/802.3/published"

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

Cl **6**
SC **6.5.2**

Page 21 of 45
10/18/2018 10:18:13 PM

Cl **6**   *SC* **6.5.2**   *P* **61**   *L* **12**   # i-56

Remein, Duane   Huawei Technologies

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

Indenting the line beginning ""PoDL PSE configuration ..." is excessively indented and therefore wraps to the next line.

SuggestedRemedy

Removed excess indents and ensure the line wraps properly is required to fit on two lines.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **6**   *SC* **6.5.2**   *P* **62**   *L* **52**   # i-245

Zimmerman, George

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

"description - Power class of the PSE port." - parameter is the power class of the detected PD on the PSE port, not the power class which the PSE itself can provide

SuggestedRemedy

Change "Power class of the PSE port." to "Power class of the PD detected on the PSE port."

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **6**   *SC* **6.5.2**   *P* **63**   *L* **15**   # i-57

Remein, Duane   Huawei Technologies

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

Indenting the line beginning "enters the the SIGNATURE_INVALID ..." needs an additional space indentation and one less "the ".

SuggestedRemedy

per comment

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **7**   *SC* **7.2**   *P* **65**   *L* **12**   # i-58

Remein, Duane   Huawei Technologies

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

missing verb

SuggestedRemedy

Change "clause focused" to "clause is focused"

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **7**   *SC* **7.2.1**   *P* **65**   *L* **18**   # i-59

Remein, Duane   Huawei Technologies

Comment Type **ER**   *Comment Status* **X**

We should future proof this sentence "EPON is defined in IEEE Std 802.3, covering Physical Layer and Media Access Control sublayer of 1GEPON and 10G-EPON interfaces." so we don't have to remember to change it when we finish Nx25G-EPON.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to read "EPON is defined in IEEE Std 802.3, covering Physical Layers and Media Access Control sublayers.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **7**   *SC* **7.2.1**   *P* **65**   *L* **20**   # i-60

Remein, Duane   Huawei Technologies

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

This sentence is incorrect "EPON is a variant of Gigabit Ethernet used in optical access." give that we also have and reference 10G-EPON.

SuggestedRemedy

Strike the sentence now before we will need to change it in the future to include Nx25G-EPON.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

Cl **7**
SC **7.2.1**

Page 22 of 45
10/18/2018 10:18:13 PM

Cl **7** *SC* **7.2.1** *P* **65** *L* **53** # i-61

Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **X**

The detailed description from here to the end of the sub-clause will likely create a maintenance headache in the future and is unnecessary. We should at most just list the appropriate clauses (which is NOT done for any other modules in this standard) with a very brief description.
I would also be fine with a simple ref to 802.3 as is done in the rest of this draft.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace from "The IEEE layering architecture of a 1G-EPON ..." to the end of the sub-clause with the following:
The following clauses in IEEE Std 802.3 define 1G-EPON:
-- Clause 30: Management,
-- Clause 60: Physical Medium Dependent(PMD) sublayer for 1G-EPON,
-- Clause 64: MPCP (Multipoint Control Protocol) for 1G-EPON,
-- Clause 65: Reconciliation Sublayer (RS), Physical Coding Sublayer (PCS), and Physical Media Attachment (PMA) sublayers for 1G-EPON.
The following clauses in I EEE Std 802.3 define 10G-EPON:
-- Clause 30: Management,
-- Clause 75: PMD sublayer for 10G-EPON,
-- Clause 76: RS, PCS, and PMA sublayers for 10G-EPON,
-- Clause 77: MPCP for 10G-EPON.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **7** *SC* **7.2.1** *P* **65** *L* **59** # i-130

Grow, Robert RMG Consulting

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

First use of PMD in document not expanded.

SuggestedRemedy

Add expansion Physical Medium Dependent (though Std 802.3 uses an uncapitalized version in 1.5 a quick check of expansions in the document uses the capitalized version).

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **7** *SC* **7.2.1** *P* **65** *L* **62** # i-131

Grow, Robert RMG Consulting

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

First use of PCS in document not expanded.

SuggestedRemedy

Add expansion Physical Coding Sublayer (though Std 802.3 uses an uncapitalized version in 1.5 a quick check of expansions in the document mostly uses the capitalized version).

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **7** *SC* **7.2.1** *P* **66** *L* **20** # i-5

Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communicatio

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

MPCP is already expanded and defined

SuggestedRemedy

Change

Clause 77: MPCP (Multipoint Control Protocol), which

to

Clause 77: MPCP, which

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **7** *SC* **7.2.1** *P* **76** *L* **1** # i-132

Grow, Robert RMG Consulting

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

First use of PMA in document not expanded.

SuggestedRemedy

Add expansion Physical Medium Dependent (though Std 802.3 uses an uncapitalized version in 1.5 a quick check of expansions in the document mostly uses the capitalized version).

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

Cl **7**
SC **7.2.1**

Page 23 of 45
10/18/2018 10:18:13 PM

Cl **7**   *SC* **7.2.1**   *P* **76**   *L* **1**   # i-133

Grow, Robert   RMG Consulting

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

First use of FEC in document not expanded.

SuggestedRemedy

Add expansion forward error correction (Std 802.3 uses an uncapitalized version in 1.5 but capitalized on a varient, RS-FEC a quick check of expansions in the document mostly uses the uncapitalized version).

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **7**   *SC* **7.2.2**   *P* **66**   *L* **24**   # i-7

Hajduczenia, Marek   Charter Communicatio

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

*** Comment submitted with the file 98317700003-hajduczenia_d30_1.docx attached ***

Principles of operation apply to 1G-EPON only and should be updated to apply to 10G-EPON as well.

SuggestedRemedy

see the attached file (hajduczenia_d30_1) for reference with tracked changes

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **7**   *SC* **7.2.2**   *P* **66**   *L* **24**   # i-62

Remein, Duane   Huawei Technologies

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

This detailed description is incorrect, will likely create a maintenance headache in the future, and is unnecessary. EPON does NOT just extend " the specification of Gigabit Ethernet".

SuggestedRemedy

Strike the sub-clause and retitle 7.2.3 from "Physical media" to "Principles of operation and media" as it cover TDM and TDMA (the principles of PON) as well as the media.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **7**   *SC* **7.2.2**   *P* **66**   *L* **28**   # i-6

Hajduczenia, Marek   Charter Communicatio

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

Missing comma after "802.3"

SuggestedRemedy

Per comment

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **7**   *SC* **7.2.2**   *P* **67**   *L* **1**   # i-8

Hajduczenia, Marek   Charter Communicatio

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

Updates are needed to Figure 7-2 to make it applicable to 1G-EPON and 10G-EPON alike.

SuggestedRemedy

change "GMII" to "GMII (1G-EPON) or XGMII (10G-EPON)

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **7**   *SC* **7.2.3**   *P* **67**   *L* **1**   # i-63

Remein, Duane   Huawei Technologies

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

This Figure is incorrect, will likely create a maintenance headache in the future, and is unnecessary. EPON does NOT just use GMII.

SuggestedRemedy

Either change GMII to xGMII and add an explanation of what is meant by this term or remove the figure.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

Cl **7**   Page 24 of 45
SC **7.2.3**   10/18/2018 10:18:13 PM

Cl **7**   *SC* **7.2.3**   *P* **67**   *L* **34**   # i-134

Grow, Robert   RMG Consulting

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

Figure 7-2 title has inconsistent capitalization of Multipoint MAC Control (Std 802.3 seems to use this capitalization).

SuggestedRemedy

Capitalize Control.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **7**   *SC* **7.2.3**   *P* **67**   *L* **38**   # i-135

Grow, Robert   RMG Consulting

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

Inconsistent capitalization of time-division multiple access (Std 802.3 is 2:1 on hyphenation, and uses lower case in all three occurances).

SuggestedRemedy

Change to: time-division multiple access.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **7**   *SC* **7.2.4**   *P* **67**   *L* **44**   # i-64

Remein, Duane   Huawei Technologies

Comment Type **ER**   *Comment Status* **X**

This description is incomplete, will likely create a maintenance headache in the future, and is unnecessary. EPON "OLT and ONU optical parameters were" indeed only partially derived "from earlier 1000 Mb/s Ethernet PMD specifications". This does of course totally ignore 10G-EPON and any future versions which we know are in the works.

SuggestedRemedy

Strike the sub-clause.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **7**   *SC* **7.2.4**   *P* **67**   *L* **44**   # i-9

Hajduczenia, Marek   Charter Communicatio

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

*** Comment submitted with the file 98317800003-hajduczenia_d30_2.docx attached ***

The text of subclause 7.2.4 needs to revised to be applicable to 1G-EPON and 10G-EPON alike.

SuggestedRemedy

Use the text in hajduczenia_d30_2 with tracked changes

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **7**   *SC* **7.2.5**   *P* **67**   *L* **57**   # i-65

Remein, Duane   Huawei Technologies

Comment Type **ER**   *Comment Status* **X**

This description is incomplete, will likely create a maintenance headache in the future, and is unnecessary. Note that the ref on pg 68 line 13 is missing 10G-EPON information "addressed with a special, reserved LLID, see IEEE Std 802.3 65.1.3.1"

SuggestedRemedy

Strike the sub-clause.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **7**   *SC* **7.2.6**   *P* **68**   *L* **61**   # i-10

Hajduczenia, Marek   Charter Communicatio

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

*** Comment submitted with the file 98318000003-hajduczenia_d30_3.docx attached ***

The text of subclause 7.2.6 needs to be updated to be applicable to 1G-EPON and 10G-EPON alike.

SuggestedRemedy

Use the text in hajduczenia_d30_3 with tracked changes from D3.0

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general   *Cl* **7**   Page 25 of 45
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn   *SC* **7.2.6**   10/18/2018 10:18:13 PM
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

Cl **7**   *SC* **7.2.6**   *P* **69**   *L* **3**   # i-67
Remein, Duane   Huawei Technologies

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **X**
"SLA" is only used one other time in the draft, there is no need to abbreviate it.

SuggestedRemedy
Strike "(SLA)" here and replace "SLA" on line 50 with "service level agreement"

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **7**   *SC* **7.2.6**   *P* **69**   *L* **45**   # i-68
Remein, Duane   Huawei Technologies

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **X**
An opportunity to do maintenance before first release "GATE and REPORT MPCPDUs are defined in Clause 64 of IEEE Std 802.3"
I would also be happy with removing the entire sub-clause but don't find this section as egregious as some others.

SuggestedRemedy
Change to: "GATE and REPORT MPCPDUs are defined in Clause 64 of IEEE Std 802.3 for 1G-EPON and in Clause 77 for 10G-EPON".

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **7**   *SC* **7.2.6**   *P* **69**   *L* **63**   # i-69
Remein, Duane   Huawei Technologies

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **X**
Another opportunity to do maintenance before first release "The MPCP registration process is presented in Figure 7-4, while details are described in Clause 64 of IEEE Std 802.3."
I would also be happy with removing the entire sub-clause but don't find this section as egregious as some others.

SuggestedRemedy
Change to: "The MPCP registration process is presented in Figure 7-4, while details are described in Clause 64 of IEEE Std 802.3 for 1G-EPON and in Clause 77 for 10G-EPON."

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **7**   *SC* **7.2.6**   *P* **70**   *L* **50**   # i-70
Remein, Duane   Huawei Technologies

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **X**
"an non-overlapping" should be "a non-overlapping"

SuggestedRemedy
per comment

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **7**   *SC* **7.2.6**   *P* **70**   *L* **55**   # i-71
Remein, Duane   Huawei Technologies

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **X**
"ONU, decision" should be "ONU, a decision"

SuggestedRemedy
per comment

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **7**   *SC* **7.2.6**   *P* **70**   *L* **60**   # i-72
Remein, Duane   Huawei Technologies

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **X**
"using its LLID, using the measured RTT" would be better as "using its LLID and the measured RTT"

SuggestedRemedy
per comment

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

Cl **7**
SC **7.2.6**

Page 26 of 45
10/18/2018 10:18:13 PM

Cl **7**   *SC* **7.2.7**   *P* **71**   *L* **1**   # i-73
Remein, Duane   Huawei Technologies

Comment Type **TR**   *Comment Status* **X**
This description is poorly balanced between 1G-EPON (which is going extinct) and 10G-EPON (which is just beginning deployments), will likely create a maintenance headache in the future, and is unnecessary.

SuggestedRemedy
Strike the sub-clause.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **7**   *SC* **7.2.8**   *P* **72**   *L* **17**   # i-74
Remein, Duane   Huawei Technologies

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **X**
Use of "GMII" in the figure dates it.
The rest of this section reads well and is very applicable to this document.

SuggestedRemedy
Change "GMII" to "xMII" and add the following at pg 71 line 61 (after sentence referencing the figure). "In Figure 7-6 the use of the term "xMII" is used to generically refer to any applicable member of the MII family of interfaces (e.g., GMII, XGMII)."

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **7**   *SC* **7.3**   *P* **75**   *L* **57**   # i-25
Anslow, Peter   Ciena Corporation

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **X**
The final bottom border in Table 7-1 should be "Thin" i.e., follow the table definition.

SuggestedRemedy
Remove the override from the final bottom border in Table 7-1

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **7**   *SC* **7.4.2**   *P* **68**   *L* **1**   # i-66
Remein, Duane   Huawei Technologies

Comment Type **ER**   *Comment Status* **X**
We seem to be using several terms for the same thing "logical link", "virtual link.", "logical interface", "virtual interface", and "LLID". While there may be differences between a link and an interface it does not appear we are being rigorous about this usage. This can confuse the reader and should be corrected.

SuggestedRemedy
Replace "virtual link" with "logical link" in 4 places.
Replace "virtual interface" with "logical interface" (18x) with the following exceptions Pg 86 line 10, pg 86 line 16, pg 86 line 23, pg 96 line 46, and pg 97 line 12 Replace "virtual interface" with "logical link"

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **7**   *SC* **7.4.2**   *P* **76**   *L* **50**   # i-75
Remein, Duane   Huawei Technologies

Comment Type **G**   *Comment Status* **X**
There are only two instances of "Clause 64/77" while there are 29 instances of "Clause 64 and Clause 77". To make future maintenance simpler we should use "Clause 64 and Clause 77" consistently.

SuggestedRemedy
Replace both instances of "Clause 64/77" with "Clause 64 and Clause 77"

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

Cl **7**
SC **7.4.2**
Page 27 of 45
10/18/2018 10:18:13 PM

Cl **7**   *SC* **7.4.2**   *P* **79**   *L* **8**   # i-144
Cummings, Rodney   National Instruments C

Comment Type **GR**   *Comment Status* **X**

"https://github.com/YangModels/yang/tree/master/standard/ieee/802.3/draft" is not the correct URL, because once 802.3.2 publishes, its YANG module will no longer be a draft.

According to the most recent decision in the IEEE 802 YANGsters group:
  https://1.ieee802.org/yangsters/yangsters-guidelines/yangsters-repository-guidelines/

the location would be
"https://github.com/YangModels/yang/tree/master/standard/ieee/802.3/published"

SuggestedRemedy

Coordinate with IEEE 802 YANGsters to determine the correct GitHub location for published IEEE working group YANG modules.

If for some reason that coordination fails, use
"https://github.com/YangModels/yang/tree/master/standard/ieee/802.3/published"

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **7**   *SC* **7.4.2**   *P* **80**   *L* **15**   # i-76
Remein, Duane   Huawei Technologies

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

This sentence will require maintenance in the future once Nx25G-EPON is approved. It adds little to the draft and can be removed, forcing the reader to read the source document, which is probable better than trying to copy/summarize that standard here. "LLIDs between the value of 0x07FFE and 0x7FFF are assigned for ONU discovery and registration. Other LLIDs are dynamically assigned by the OLT during the registration process."

SuggestedRemedy

Strike the sentence

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **7**   *SC* **7.4.2**   *P* **80**   *L* **20**   # i-11
Hajduczenia, Marek   Charter Communicatio

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

Unnecessary repetition of reference

SuggestedRemedy

Remove "; see IEEE Std 802.3, 65.1.3.3 for 1G-EPON and 76.2.6.1.3 for 10G-EPON."
Change reference for typedef mpcp-llid to read
"IEEE Std 802.3, 65.1.3.3 for 1G-EPON and 76.2.6.1.3 for 10G-EPON"
Use the same reference for typedef mpcp-llid-count as well

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **7**   *SC* **7.4.2**   *P* **81**   *L* **34**   # i-12
Hajduczenia, Marek   Charter Communicatio

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

"mpcp" should be all caps

SuggestedRemedy

Change "mpcp" to "MPCP"

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **7**   *SC* **7.4.2**   *P* **81**   *L* **64**   # i-13
Hajduczenia, Marek   Charter Communicatio

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

These are not "Ethernet interfaces" but "EPON interfaces" that this module defines, being the extension of Ethernet interfaces.

SuggestedRemedy

Change all instances of "Ethernet interface" to "EPON interface" in this module

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line   *Cl* **7**   Page 28 of 45
SC **7.4.2**   10/18/2018 10:18:13 PM

Cl **7**   *SC* **7.4.2**   *P* **84**   *L* **34**   # i-15

Hajduczenia, Marek   Charter Communicatio

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

Confusing description of typedef trx-admin-state

SuggestedRemedy

Change description to read:
When read as 'disabled', the transmitter is currently disabled (not transmittiing).
When set to 'disabled', the transmitter is expected to be disabled (stop transmitting)

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **O**

Cl **7**   *SC* **7.4.2**   *P* **84**   *L* **57**   # i-14

Hajduczenia, Marek   Charter Communicatio

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

Empty reference field

SuggestedRemedy

Strike

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **O**

Cl **7**   *SC* **7.4.2**   *P* **84**   *L* **57**   # i-77

Remein, Duane   Huawei Technologies

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

It seems odd to have a blank Reference

SuggestedRemedy

Change "" to "Not Applicable"

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **O**

Cl **7**   *SC* **7.4.2**   *P* **84**   *L* **64**   # i-78

Remein, Duane   Huawei Technologies

Comment Type   **GR**   *Comment Status*   **X**

We use the term "1000BASE-PX" only four times in this section while 1G-EPON is used 18x. Similarly 10GBASE-PR and 10/1GBASE-PRX are used 3x each while 10G-EPON is used 14x. For ease of maintenance it would be better to use 1G-EPON and 10G-EPON consistently

SuggestedRemedy

Pg 84 line 65 replace "1000BASE-PX" with "1G-EPON"
Pg 106 line 61 replace "1000BASE-PX PHY" with "1G-EPON PHYs"
Pg 107 line 1 replace "10GBASE-PR or 10/1GBASE-PRX" with "10G-EPON"
Pg 107 line 26 & 56 replace "1000BASE-PX, 10GBASE-PR or 10/1GBASE-PRX" with "1G-EPON or 10G-EPON"

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **O**

Cl **7**   *SC* **7.4.2**   *P* **86**   *L* **10**   # i-79

Remein, Duane   Huawei Technologies

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

Indenting the line beginning "This action applies to an OLT or ONU virtual interface.";"
should be indented one additional space.
Same issue line 23.

SuggestedRemedy

per comment

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **O**

Cl **7**   *SC* **7.4.2**   *P* **86**   *L* **23**   # i-80

Remein, Duane   Huawei Technologies

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

Indenting the line beginning "This action applies to an OLT or ONU virtual interface."
should be indented one additional space.

SuggestedRemedy

per comment

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **O**

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general   *Cl* **7**   Page 29 of 45
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn   *SC* **7.4.2**   10/18/2018 10:18:13 PM
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

Cl **7**   *SC* **7.4.2**   *P* **86**   *L* **64**   # i-81

Remein, Duane   Huawei Technologies

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

leaf fec-mode {
Why is this statement here? "It has a distinct value for each logical link."? FEC is not
configurable on an llid by llid basis

SuggestedRemedy

Change:
"It has a distinct value ..." to:
"This object has the same value ..."

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **7**   *SC* **7.4.2**   *P* **88**   *L* **21**   # i-82

Remein, Duane   Huawei Technologies

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

leaf trx-transmit-admin-state {
This statement "It has a distinct value for each logical link" implies the object can be rw for
both LLIDs at the ONU. This is not implied in 802.3.1 where is states "At the OLT it has a
distinct value for each virtual interface."

SuggestedRemedy

Change:
"It has a distinct value ..." to:
"At the OLT this object has a distinct value ..."

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **7**   *SC* **7.4.2**   *P* **88**   *L* **37**   # i-83

Remein, Duane   Huawei Technologies

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

The sentence reads poorly "Contain all Ethernet interface specific capabilities."

SuggestedRemedy

Change to "This container includes all Ethernet interface specific capabilities."

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **7**   *SC* **7.4.2**   *P* **88**   *L* **63**   # i-190

Weber, Karl   Beckhoff Automation

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

frames is not an unit according to the International System of Units see
https://www.bipm.org/utils/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf

SuggestedRemedy

Delete units - line

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **7**   *SC* **7.4.2**   *P* **89**   *L* **27**   # i-191

Weber, Karl   Beckhoff Automation

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

frames is not an unit according to the International System of Units see
https://www.bipm.org/utils/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf

SuggestedRemedy

Delete units - line

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **7**   *SC* **7.4.2**   *P* **89**   *L* **58**   # i-192

Weber, Karl   Beckhoff Automation

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

frames is not an unit according to the International System of Units see
https://www.bipm.org/utils/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf

SuggestedRemedy

Delete units - line

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general   *Cl* **7**   Page 30 of 45
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn   *SC* **7.4.2**   10/18/2018 10:18:13 PM
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

Cl **7**   *SC* **7.4.2**   *P* **90**   *L* **4**   # i-84

Remein, Duane   Huawei Technologies

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

leaf mpcp-discovery-window-count {
This statement differs from the definition in the ref. "It has a distinct value for each logical
link."

SuggestedRemedy

After leaf mpcp-discovery-window-count { add:
when "../../ompe-mode = 'olt'";
Change:
"This object is applicable for an OLT and an ONU. It has a distinct value for each logical
link. At the ONU, the value should be zero." to:
"This object is applicable for an OLT and has the same value for each logical link."

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **7**   *SC* **7.4.2**   *P* **90**   *L* **9**   # i-86

Remein, Duane   Huawei Technologies

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

Indenting the line beginning "re-initialization of the management system, and at other
times" should be indented one less space.
Exact same issue line 38, pg 91 line 4, pg 91 line 34, pg 91 line 64, pg 93 line 25,, pg 95
line 54, pg 97 line 45, pg 98 line 7, pg 98 line 35, pg 99 line 2, pg 98 line 65, pg 100 line
31,, pg 106 line 44, pg 107 line 9, pg 107 line 38, pg 108 line 3, pg 114 line 35, and pg 115
line 1.
Note there are instances where the quoted text is correctly indented and thus a global
search and replace cannot be used.

SuggestedRemedy

per comment

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **7**   *SC* **7.4.2**   *P* **90**   *L* **22**   # i-193

Weber, Karl   Beckhoff Automation

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

discovery timeout is not an unit according to the International System of Units see
https://www.bipm.org/utils/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf

SuggestedRemedy

Delete units - line

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **7**   *SC* **7.4.2**   *P* **90**   *L* **34**   # i-85

Remein, Duane   Huawei Technologies

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

leaf mpcp-discovery-timeout-count {
This statement differs from the definition in the ref. "It has a distinct value for each logical
link."
Same issue pg 90 line 34,

SuggestedRemedy

After leaf mpcp-discovery-timeout-count { add:
when "../../ompe-mode = 'olt'";
Change:
"This object is applicable for an OLT and an ONU. It has a distinct value for each logical
link. At the ONU, the value should be zero." to:
"This object is applicable for an OLT and has the same value for each logical link."

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **7**   *SC* **7.4.2**   *P* **90**   *L* **51**   # i-194

Weber, Karl   Beckhoff Automation

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

frames is not an unit according to the International System of Units see
https://www.bipm.org/utils/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf

SuggestedRemedy

Delete units - line

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

Cl **7**
SC **7.4.2**

Page 31 of 45
10/18/2018 10:18:13 PM

Cl **7**   *SC* **7.4.2**   *P* **90**   *L* **64**   # i-87
Remein, Duane   Huawei Technologies

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

leaf out-mpcp-register-req {
This cannot be true, Reg-Req are only transmitted by the ONU: "This object is applicable
for an OLT and an ONU. It has a distinct value for each logical link. At the ONU, the value
should be zero."

SuggestedRemedy

After leaf out-mpcp-register-req { add:
when "../../ompe-mode = 'onu'";
Change
"This object is applicable for an OLT and an ONU. It has a distinct value for each logical
link. At the ONU, the value should be zero." to:
"This object is applicable for an ONU and has the same value for each logical link."

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **O**

Cl **7**   *SC* **7.4.2**   *P* **91**   *L* **16**   # i-195
Weber, Karl   Beckhoff Automation

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

frames is not an unit according to the International System of Units see
https://www.bipm.org/utils/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf

SuggestedRemedy

Delete units - line

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **O**

Cl **7**   *SC* **7.4.2**   *P* **91**   *L* **30**   # i-88
Remein, Duane   Huawei Technologies

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

leaf in-mpcp-register-req {
The ONU never receives Reg-Req "This object is applicable for an OLT and an ONU. At
the ONU, the value should be zero for each logical link."

SuggestedRemedy

After leaf in-mpcp-register-req { add:
when "../../ompe-mode = 'olt'";
Change:
"This object is applicable for an OLT and an ONU. At the ONU, the value should be zero
for each logical link." to:
"This object is applicable for an OLT and has the same value each logical link."

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **O**

Cl **7**   *SC* **7.4.2**   *P* **91**   *L* **47**   # i-196
Weber, Karl   Beckhoff Automation

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

frames is not an unit according to the International System of Units see
https://www.bipm.org/utils/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf

SuggestedRemedy

Delete units - line

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **O**

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general   *Cl* **7**   Page 32 of 45
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn   *SC* **7.4.2**   10/18/2018 10:18:13 PM
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

Cl **7**   *SC* **7.4.2**   *P* **91**   *L* **60**   # i-89

Remein, Duane   Huawei Technologies

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

leaf out-mpcp-register-ack {
"The value should be zero for each logical link given that these messages are only
transmitted from the ONU." Really??? Maybe we should make this a constant = 0 then.
The same error exist at the following locations pg 92, line 55, pg 94 line 16, pg 95 line 12
(see separate comments).

SuggestedRemedy

After leaf statement add
when "../../ompe-mode = 'onu'";
Change:
"This object is applicable for an OLT and an ONU. The value should be zero for each
logical link." to:
"This object is applicable for an ONU and has a distinct value for each logical link."

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **7**   *SC* **7.4.2**   *P* **92**   *L* **11**   # i-197

Weber, Karl   Beckhoff Automation

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

frames is not an unit according to the International System of Units see
https://www.bipm.org/utils/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf

SuggestedRemedy

Delete units - line

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **7**   *SC* **7.4.2**   *P* **92**   *L* **24**   # i-90

Remein, Duane   Huawei Technologies

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

leaf in-mpcp-register-ack {
It is not clear to me why this para exists: "This object is applicable for an OLT and an ONU.
It has a distinct value for each logical link. At the ONU, the value should be zero."
The ONU cannot receive Reg-Ack messages.
Same issue for the following locations/leafs (NO separate comments).
pg 93 line 21: leaf in-mpcp-report {
pg 93 line 50: leaf out-mpcp-gate {
pg 94 line 46: leaf out-mpcp-register {

SuggestedRemedy

After the leaf statements add:
when "../../ompe-mode = 'olt'";
Change at each location:
"This object is applicable for an OLT and an ONU. It has a distinct value for each logical
link. At the ONU, the value should be zero."" to:
"This object is applicable for an OLT and has the same value for each logical link."

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **7**   *SC* **7.4.2**   *P* **92**   *L* **42**   # i-198

Weber, Karl   Beckhoff Automation

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

frames is not an unit according to the International System of Units see
https://www.bipm.org/utils/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf

SuggestedRemedy

Delete units - line

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general   *Cl* **7**   Page 33 of 45
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn   *SC* **7.4.2**   10/18/2018 10:18:13 PM
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

Cl **7**   *SC* **7.4.2**   *P* **92**   *L* **55**   # i-91

Remein, Duane   Huawei Technologies

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

leaf out-mpcp-report {
"The value should be zero for each logical link given that these messages are only
transmitted from the ONU." Really??? Maybe we should make this a constant = 0 then.
The same error exist at: pg 92, line 55, pg 94 line 16, pg 95 line 12.

SuggestedRemedy

After leaf out-mpcp-report { add
when "../../ompe-mode = 'onu'";
Change:
"This object is applicable for an OLT and an ONU. The value should be zero for each
logical link." to:
"This object is applicable for an ONU and has a distinct value for each logical link."

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **7**   *SC* **7.4.2**   *P* **93**   *L* **6**   # i-199

Weber, Karl   Beckhoff Automation

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

frames is not an unit according to the International System of Units see
https://www.bipm.org/utils/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf

SuggestedRemedy

Delete units - line

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **7**   *SC* **7.4.2**   *P* **93**   *L* **37**   # i-200

Weber, Karl   Beckhoff Automation

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

frames is not an unit according to the International System of Units see
https://www.bipm.org/utils/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf

SuggestedRemedy

Delete units - line

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **7**   *SC* **7.4.2**   *P* **93**   *L* **58**   # i-16

Hajduczenia, Marek   Charter Communicatio

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

Stranded reference to ifCounterDiscontinuityTime

SuggestedRemedy

replace all instances of

as indicated by the value of the ifCounterDiscontinuityTime object

with

as indicated by the value of the 'discontinuity-time' leaf defined in the ietf-interfaces YANG
module (IETF RFC 8343)

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **7**   *SC* **7.4.2**   *P* **94**   *L* **3**   # i-201

Weber, Karl   Beckhoff Automation

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

frames is not an unit according to the International System of Units see
https://www.bipm.org/utils/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf

SuggestedRemedy

Delete units - line

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general   *Cl* **7**   Page 34 of 45
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn   *SC* **7.4.2**   10/18/2018 10:18:13 PM
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

Cl **7**   *SC* **7.4.2**   *P* **94**   *L* **16**   # i-92
Remein, Duane   Huawei Technologies

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

leaf in-mpcp-gate {
"The value should be zero for each logical link given that these messages are only
transmitted from the ONU." Really??? Maybe we should make this a constant = 0 then.
The same error exist at: pg 92, line 55, pg 94 line 16, pg 95 line 12.

SuggestedRemedy

After leaf in-mpcp-gate { add
when "../../ompe-mode = 'onu'";
Change:
"This object is applicable for an OLT and an ONU. The value should be zero for each
logical link." to:
"This object is applicable for an ONU and has a distinct value for each logical link."

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **7**   *SC* **7.4.2**   *P* **95**   *L* **12**   # i-93
Remein, Duane   Huawei Technologies

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

leaf in-mpcp-register {
"The value should be zero for each logical link given that these messages are only
transmitted from the ONU." Really??? Maybe we should make this a constant = 0 then.
The same error exist at: pg 92, line 55, pg 94 line 16, pg 95 line 12.

SuggestedRemedy

After leaf in-mpcp-register { add
when "../../ompe-mode = 'onu'";
Change:
"This object is applicable for an OLT and an ONU. The value should be zero for each
logical link." to:
"This object is applicable for an ONU and has a distinct value for each logical link."

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **7**   *SC* **7.4.2**   *P* **94**   *L* **33**   # i-202
Weber, Karl   Beckhoff Automation

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

frames is not an unit according to the International System of Units see
https://www.bipm.org/utils/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf

SuggestedRemedy

Delete units - line

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **7**   *SC* **7.4.2**   *P* **95**   *L* **39**   # i-204
Weber, Karl   Beckhoff Automation

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

frames is not an unit according to the International System of Units see
https://www.bipm.org/utils/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf

SuggestedRemedy

Delete units - line

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **7**   *SC* **7.4.2**   *P* **94**   *L* **64**   # i-203
Weber, Karl   Beckhoff Automation

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

frames is not an unit according to the International System of Units see
https://www.bipm.org/utils/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf

SuggestedRemedy

Delete units - line

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **7**   *SC* **7.4.2**   *P* **95**   *L* **45**   # i-94
Remein, Duane   Huawei Technologies

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

For each leaf in this container it should be made clear that this is not a count for all frames
but only MPCP frames.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "A count of frames" to "A count of MPCP frames" in the description of each leaf in
this container.
Locations (pg/Line): 95/45, 96/6, 96/31, 96/64, 97/34, 97/63, 98/25, 98/55, 99/22, 99/53,
and 100/20

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general   *Cl* **7**   Page 35 of 45
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn   *SC* **7.4.2**   10/18/2018 10:18:13 PM
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

Cl **7** *SC* **7.4.2** *P* **96** *L* **1** # i-205
Weber, Karl   Beckhoff Automation

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

frames is not an unit according to the International System of Units see
https://www.bipm.org/utils/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf

SuggestedRemedy

Delete units - line

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **7** *SC* **7.4.2** *P* **96** *L* **27** # i-206
Weber, Karl   Beckhoff Automation

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

frames is not an unit according to the International System of Units see
https://www.bipm.org/utils/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf

SuggestedRemedy

Delete units - line

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **7** *SC* **7.4.2** *P* **96** *L* **35** # i-17
Hajduczenia, Marek   Charter Communicatio

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

Stranded reference to 65.1.3.3.1 or 76.2.6.1.3.1

SuggestedRemedy

Insert "IEEE Std 802.3, " before "65.1.3.3.1 or 76.2.6.1.3.1", "65.1.3.3.2 or 76.2.6.1.3.2",
and "65.1.3.3.3 or 76.2.6.1.3.3", where reference to 802.3 is absent

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **7** *SC* **7.4.2** *P* **96** *L* **45** # i-95
Remein, Duane   Huawei Technologies

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

leaf ompe-onu-frames-with-good-llid-good-crc8 {
How is a counter that counts frames with valid SLID _in an ONU_ applicable to the OLT??

SuggestedRemedy

After leaf ompe-onu-frames-with-good-llid-good-crc8 { add:
when "../../ompe-mode = 'onu'";
Change:
"This object is applicable for an OLT and an ONU. At the OLT, it has distinct values for
each virtual interface." to
"This object is applicable for an ONU and has a distinct value for each logical link."

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **7** *SC* **7.4.2** *P* **96** *L* **46** # i-96
Remein, Duane   Huawei Technologies

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

"has distinct values for each virtual interface" really? Multiple values for each LLID?
Same issue pg 97 line 12

SuggestedRemedy

Change:
"has distinct values" to:
"has a distinct value"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general *Cl* **7** Page 36 of 45
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn *SC* **7.4.2** 10/18/2018 10:18:14 PM
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

Cl **7**	*SC* **7.4.2**	*P* **96**	*L* **58**	#	i-97

Remein, Duane   Huawei Technologies

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

leaf ompe-olt-frames-with-good-llid-good-crc8 {
We should be clear that a counter that counts frames with valid SLID _in an OLT_ is not applicable to the ONU.

SuggestedRemedy

After leaf ompe-olt-frames-with-good-llid-good-crc8 {" add
when "../../ompe-mode = 'olt'";
At pg 97 line 12 Change:
"At the OLT, it has distinct values for each virtual interface." to
"This object is applicable for an OLT and has a distinct value for each logical link."

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **7**	*SC* **7.4.2**	*P* **96**	*L* **61**	#	i-207

Weber, Karl   Beckhoff Automation

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

frames is not an unit according to the International System of Units see
https://www.bipm.org/utils/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf

SuggestedRemedy

Delete units - line

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **7**	*SC* **7.4.2**	*P* **97**	*L* **29**	#	i-208

Weber, Karl   Beckhoff Automation

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

frames is not an unit according to the International System of Units see
https://www.bipm.org/utils/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf

SuggestedRemedy

Delete units - line

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **7**	*SC* **7.4.2**	*P* **97**	*L* **41**	#	i-98

Remein, Duane   Huawei Technologies

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

leaf in-ompe-frames-with-bad-llid {
has multiple errors :
1) The description implies that each device has a count for every possible LLID (2^15).
2) It has an incorrect ref
3) Corrected ref clearly states this is only applicable for the OLT: "A count of frames received that contain a valid SLD field in an OLT"

SuggestedRemedy

1) Change:
"This object is applicable for an OLT and an ONU. It has a distinct value for each logical link." to
"This object is applicable for an OLT and has the same value for each logical link."
2) Change Ref from 30.3.7.1.5 to 30.3.7.1.8
3) After "leaf in-ompe-frames-with-bad-llid { " add: "when "../../ompe-mode = 'olt'";"

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **7**	*SC* **7.4.2**	*P* **97**	*L* **57**	#	i-209

Weber, Karl   Beckhoff Automation

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

frames is not an unit according to the International System of Units see
https://www.bipm.org/utils/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf

SuggestedRemedy

Delete units - line

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **7**	*SC* **7.4.2**	*P* **98**	*L* **20**	#	i-210

Weber, Karl   Beckhoff Automation

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

frames is not an unit according to the International System of Units see
https://www.bipm.org/utils/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf

SuggestedRemedy

Delete units - line

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

Cl **7**
SC **7.4.2**

Page 37 of 45
10/18/2018 10:18:14 PM

Cl **7**   *SC* **7.4.2**   *P* **98**   *L* **49**   # i-211

Weber, Karl   Beckhoff Automation

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

frames is not an unit according to the International System of Units see
https://www.bipm.org/utils/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf

SuggestedRemedy

Delete units - line

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **7**   *SC* **7.4.2**   *P* **99**   *L* **16**   # i-212

Weber, Karl   Beckhoff Automation

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

frames is not an unit according to the International System of Units see
https://www.bipm.org/utils/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf

SuggestedRemedy

Delete units - line

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **7**   *SC* **7.4.2**   *P* **99**   *L* **33**   # i-99

Remein, Duane   Huawei Technologies

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

Indenting
The line beginning "re-initialization of the management system, and at other times" and the
next line should be indented one less space.
The line beginning "defined in the ietf-interfaces YANG module (IETF RFC 8343).";"
should be indented two less spaces.

SuggestedRemedy

per comment

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **7**   *SC* **7.4.2**   *P* **99**   *L* **47**   # i-213

Weber, Karl   Beckhoff Automation

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

frames is not an unit according to the International System of Units see
https://www.bipm.org/utils/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf

SuggestedRemedy

Delete units - line

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **7**   *SC* **7.4.2**   *P* **100**   *L* **14**   # i-214

Weber, Karl   Beckhoff Automation

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

frames is not an unit according to the International System of Units see
https://www.bipm.org/utils/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf

SuggestedRemedy

Delete units - line

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **7**   *SC* **7.4.2**   *P* **100**   *L* **58**   # i-215

Weber, Karl   Beckhoff Automation

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

frames is not an unit according to the International System of Units see
https://www.bipm.org/utils/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf

SuggestedRemedy

Delete units - line

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general   *Cl* **7**   Page 38 of 45
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn   *SC* **7.4.2**   10/18/2018 10:18:14 PM
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

Cl **7**   *SC* **7.4.2**   *P* **105**   *L* **2**   # i-100

Remein, Duane   Huawei Technologies

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

This statement is self contradicting: "At the OLT, the measurement is performed in a continuous manner, for each incoming data burst, and stored in a rolling 15-minutes' long observation bin."
It can be a continuous measurement or a burst measurement but not both.
Same issue pg 105 line 32,

SuggestedRemedy

Strike ", for each incoming data burst,"

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **7**   *SC* **7.4.2**   *P* **106**   *L* **24**   # i-216

Weber, Karl   Beckhoff Automation

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

code-group is not an unit according to the International System of Units see https://www.bipm.org/utils/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf

SuggestedRemedy

Delete units - line

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **7**   *SC* **7.4.2**   *P* **106**   *L* **29**   # i-101

Remein, Duane   Huawei Technologies

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

leaf fec-code-group-violations {
This description does not match the description in the Ref (30.5.1.1.14 aPCSCodingViolation) which refers to Table 35-1 dealing with GMII code groups (8b10b I believe) not FEC codewords. I'm not quite sure which is in error, the description (which looks wrong given the object name and ref) or the Ref. In either case this needs fixing.
The suggested solution assumed the description is in error.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace the first two para of this description with:
"For 1G-EPON this is a count of the number of events that cause the PHY to indicate "Data reception error" or "Carrier Extend Error" on the GMII (see Table 35-1 of 802.3). The contents of this counter is undefined when FEC is operating.
For 10G-EPON this object is not applicable."

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **7**   *SC* **7.4.2**   *P* **106**   *L* **56**   # i-217

Weber, Karl   Beckhoff Automation

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

code-group is not an unit according to the International System of Units see https://www.bipm.org/utils/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf

SuggestedRemedy

Delete units - line

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **7**   *SC* **7.4.2**   *P* **106**   *L* **61**   # i-102

Remein, Duane   Huawei Technologies

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

leaf fec-buffer-head-coding-violations {
It should be noted that this counter is only valid when FEC is enabled.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the first para to read:
"For 1000BASE-PX PHY, this object represents the count of the number of invalid code-groups received directly from the link when FEC is enabled. When FEC is disabled this counter stops counting."

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **7**   *SC* **7.4.2**   *P* **107**   *L* **21**   # i-218

Weber, Karl   Beckhoff Automation

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

code-group is not an unit according to the International System of Units see https://www.bipm.org/utils/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf

SuggestedRemedy

Delete units - line

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general   *Cl* **7**   Page 39 of 45
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn   *SC* **7.4.2**   10/18/2018 10:18:14 PM
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

Cl **7**	*SC* **7.4.2**	*P* **107**	*L* **50**	# i-219

Weber, Karl   Beckhoff Automation

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

code-group is not an unit according to the International System of Units see
https://www.bipm.org/utils/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf

SuggestedRemedy

Delete units - line

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **7**	*SC* **7.4.2**	*P* **109**	*L* **6**	# i-103

Remein, Duane   Huawei Technologies

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

Change "in to" to "to"

SuggestedRemedy

per comment

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **7**	*SC* **7.4.2**	*P* **110**	*L* **3**	# i-104

Remein, Duane   Huawei Technologies

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

This statement is redundant "It has a distinct value for each logical link and every queue. At
the ONU, it has a distinct value for every queue." because the previous sentence is
missing "At the OLT"
Same issue pg 110 line 40, pg 111 line 14, pg 111 line 43, 112 line 65, and pg 114 line 31.

SuggestedRemedy

Change:
"It has a distinct value for each logical link and every queue." to:
"At the OLT it has a distinct value for each logical link and every queue."

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **7**	*SC* **7.4.2**	*P* **110**	*L* **35**	# i-105

Remein, Duane   Huawei Technologies

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

Indenting the line beginning "ONU. It can have a value between 0 and 7, limited by the
value" should be indented one less space.

SuggestedRemedy

per comment

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **7**	*SC* **7.4.2**	*P* **113**	*L* **40**	# i-220

Weber, Karl   Beckhoff Automation

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

TQ is not an unit according to the International System of Units see
https://www.bipm.org/utils/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf

SuggestedRemedy

Delete units - line

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **7**	*SC* **7.4.2**	*P* **114**	*L* **21**	# i-106

Remein, Duane   Huawei Technologies

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

leaf in-mpcp-queue-frames {
The wording of this description does not match the ref. and does not make sense. "This
object reflects the number of frame reception events into the corresponding upstream
transmission queue."
The wording in 802.3.1 is: "A count of the number of times a frame reception occurs from
the corresponding 'Queue'."

SuggestedRemedy

Change to read "A count of the number of times a frame reception event results in a frame
being queued in (for ONUs) or received from (for OLTs) the corresponding queue."

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general   *Cl* **7**   Page 40 of 45
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn   *SC* **7.4.2**   10/18/2018 10:18:14 PM
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

Cl **7** *SC* **7.4.2** *P* **115** *L* **19** # i-107

Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies

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

Indenting
In the description beginning ""This object reflects the number of frame drop events from" all lines except the first line should be indented one additional space.

SuggestedRemedy

per comment

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **7** *SC* **7.4.2** *P* **116** *L* **32** # i-221

Weber, Karl Beckhoff Automation

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

TQ (16ns) is not an unit according to the International System of Units see
https://www.bipm.org/utils/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf

SuggestedRemedy

Delete units - line

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **7** *SC* **7.4.2** *P* **116** *L* **42** # i-30

Zhuang, Yan Huawei Technologies

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

There are 8 shall statements in the descriptions of mpcp-related objects. I do not suppose these are intended as mandatry requirements here.
--from Glen Kramer

SuggestedRemedy

search and replace without using the word "shall"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **7** *SC* **7.4.2** *P* **116** *L* **50** # i-108

Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies

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

This object should reference 802.3.1 not 802.3. At the very least it should also point to the proper section in 77 (77.3.3.2).

SuggestedRemedy

Change:
"64.3.3.2" to
"dot3MpcpSyncTime"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **7** *SC* **7.4.2** *P* **116** *L* **65** # i-109

Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies

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

There is no cable in EPON "is cable of supporting"`

SuggestedRemedy

Change cable to capable

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **7** *SC* **7.4.2** *P* **118** *L* **18** # i-223

Weber, Karl Beckhoff Automation

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

TQ (16ns) is not an unit according to the International System of Units see
https://www.bipm.org/utils/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf

SuggestedRemedy

Delete units - line

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

Cl **7**
SC **7.4.2**

Page 41 of 45
10/18/2018 10:18:14 PM

Cl **7**   *SC* **7.4.2**   *P* **118**   *L* **44**   # i-222
Weber, Karl   Beckhoff Automation

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status* **X**
TQ (16ns) is not an unit according to the International System of Units see
https://www.bipm.org/utils/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf

SuggestedRemedy
Delete units - line

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **7**   *SC* **7.4.2**   *P* **119**   *L* **5**   # i-224
Weber, Karl   Beckhoff Automation

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status* **X**
TQ (16ns) is not an unit according to the International System of Units see
https://www.bipm.org/utils/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf

SuggestedRemedy
Delete units - line

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **7**   *SC* **7.4.2**   *P* **119**   *L* **20**   # i-110
Remein, Duane   Huawei Technologies

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **X**
leaf mpcp-round-trip-time {
Round trip time is not applicable to an ONU.

SuggestedRemedy
After leaf mpcp-round-trip-time { add:
when "../../ompe-mode = 'olt'";

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **7**   *SC* **7.4.2**   *P* **119**   *L* **38**   # i-111
Remein, Duane   Huawei Technologies

Comment Type   **TR**   *Comment Status* **X**
leaf mpcp-round-trip-time {
If the value at the OLT is always zero why is it considered applicable? This is also implied
in the ref which states "A read-only value that indicates the maximum number of grants an
ONU can store"

SuggestedRemedy
After leaf mpcp-round-trip-time { add:
when "../../ompe-mode = 'onu'";
Change:
"This object is applicable for an OLT and an ONU. It has a distinct value for each logical
link. At the OLT, the value should be zero.";" to:
"This object is applicable for an ONU and has a distinct value for each logical link.";"

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **7**   *SC* **7.4.2**   *P* **120**   *L* **1**   # i-112
Remein, Duane   Huawei Technologies

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status* **X**
Indenting the line beginning "This object is applicable for an OLT and an ONU. It has the
same" should be indented one less space.
Exact same issue exists on line 49

SuggestedRemedy
per comment

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general   *Cl* **7**   Page 42 of 45
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn   *SC* **7.4.2**   10/18/2018 10:18:14 PM
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

Cl **7**   *SC* **7.4.2**   *P* **120**   *L* **20**   # i-113

Remein, Duane   Huawei Technologies

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

leaf mpcp-maximum-queue-count-per-report {
Why is this applicable to an ONU given "This object reflects the maximum number of queues (0-7) that can
be accepted by the OLT ..."

SuggestedRemedy

After leaf mpcp-maximum-queue-count-per-report { add:
when "../../ompe-mode = olt'";
Change:
"This object is applicable for an OLT and an ONU. It has a distinct value for each logical link.";" to:
"This object is applicable for an OLT and has the same value for each logical link.";"

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **7**   *SC* **7.4.2**   *P* **142**   *L* **18**   # i-227

Weber, Karl   Beckhoff Automation

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

uint64 is too large

SuggestedRemedy

restrict to unt16

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **7**   *SC* **7.4.2**   *P* **142**   *L* **18**   # i-226

Weber, Karl   Beckhoff Automation

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

Is not mtu but pdu

SuggestedRemedy

change to oammtu

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **7**   *SC* **7.4.2**   *P* **142**   *L* **20**   # i-225

Weber, Karl   Beckhoff Automation

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

bytes is not an unit according to the International System of Units see
https://www.bipm.org/utils/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf

SuggestedRemedy

Delete units - line

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **7**   *SC* **7.4.2**   *P* **145**   *L* **28**   # i-230

Weber, Karl   Beckhoff Automation

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

uint64 is too large

SuggestedRemedy

restrict to unt16

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **7**   *SC* **7.4.2**   *P* **145**   *L* **28**   # i-229

Weber, Karl   Beckhoff Automation

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

Is not mtu but pdu

SuggestedRemedy

change to oammtu

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general   *Cl* **7**   Page 43 of 45
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn   *SC* **7.4.2**   10/18/2018 10:18:14 PM
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

Cl **7** *SC* **7.4.2** *P* **145** *L* **29** # i-228

Weber, Karl Beckhoff Automation

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

bytes is not an unit according to the International System of Units see
https://www.bipm.org/utils/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf

SuggestedRemedy

Delete units - line

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **8** *SC* **8.2.4** *P* **122** *L* **3** # i-136

Grow, Robert RMG Consulting

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

The expansion and acronym for OAMPDU are not closely enough linked.

SuggestedRemedy

Add "(OAMPDU)" after "Ethernet OAM protocol data unit".

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **8** *SC* **8.3** *P* **122** *L* **46** # i-137

Grow, Robert RMG Consulting

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

Netconf/Restconf are not capitalized in this case.

SuggestedRemedy

NETCONF/RESTCONF

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **8** *SC* **8.3.** *P* **122** *L* **46** # i-114

Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies

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

Capitalization "Netconf/Restconf" should be in all caps

SuggestedRemedy

per comment

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **8** *SC* **8.4** *P* **126** *L* **46** # i-26

Anslow, Peter Ciena Corporation

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

The final bottom border in Table 8-1 should be "Thin" i.e., follow the table definition.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the override from the final bottom border in Table 8-1

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **8** *SC* **8.5.2** *P* **130** *L* **9** # i-145

Cummings, Rodney National Instruments C

Comment Type **GR** *Comment Status* **X**

"https://github.com/YangModels/yang/tree/master/standard/ieee/802.3/draft" is not the
correct URL, because once 802.3.2 publishes, its YANG module will no longer be a draft.

According to the most recent decision in the IEEE 802 YANGsters group:
https://1.ieee802.org/yangsters/yangsters-guidelines/yangsters-repository-guidelines/

SuggestedRemedy

Coordinate with IEEE 802 YANGsters to determine the correct GitHub location for
published IEEE working group YANG modules.

If for some reason that coordination fails, use
"https://github.com/YangModels/yang/tree/master/standard/ieee/802.3/published"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

Cl **8**
SC **8.5.2**

Page 44 of 45
10/18/2018 10:18:14 PM

Cl **8**   *SC* **8.5.2**   *P* **135**   *L* **56**   # i-138

Grow, Robert   RMG Consulting

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

I can't make sense of this, it seems like something is missing from the attribute
specification. The length is specified as a hex string of 8 but the definition is a 24-bit
value. What about the other two hex digits? Following the reference to reference to Std
802-2001 I can't find anything beyond definition text of an OUI).

SuggestedRemedy

The lengths need to be reconciled, either to add missing information on what is
concatenated with the OUI to get to 8 hex digits, or to change to 6 hex digits.

The use of a superseded reference should be fixed. The corresponding topic is in Clause 8
of IEEE Std 802-2014.

IEEE Std 802-20xx (either 2001 or 2014) should be added to the references.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **8**   *SC* **8.5.2**   *P* **143**   *L* **23**   # i-115

Remein, Duane   Huawei Technologies

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

Indenting the line beginning ""Enable or disable monitoring." appear to be indented less
than the rest of the description for no apparent reason.

SuggestedRemedy

Adjust the indenting to match the rest of the description

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

Cl **8**   *SC* **8.5.2**   *P* **150**   *L* **17**   # i-29

Zhuang, Yan   Huawei Technologies

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

Word "will" shall not be used.
--from Glen Kramer

SuggestedRemedy

Replace ""This leaf will never be set to 'threshold-event-type'."; with

"This leaf is never set to 'threshold-event-type'.";

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **O**

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general   *Cl* **8**   Page 45 of 45
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn   *SC* **8.5.2**   10/18/2018 10:18:14 PM
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line