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802.1CBdb Draft 0.5 summary

• P802.1CBdb draft 0.5 includes updates reflecting the resolutions of the comments on draft 0.4:
  – Syntax corrections on the YANG module provided with Draft 0.4
  – New CBdb YANG module designed as an augmentation of CBcv’s stream type YANG
  – Removal of editor’s notes.
  – Editorial clarifications.
  – Repairing of the broken cross-reference marker of clause 7.4.3.4 (VectorRecoveryAlgorithm) affecting the cross-referred contents in Annex A and clause 7.
  – Highlighting (underlined green characters) of automatically changed cross-references in «Subclause» columns in Annex A tables.
  – Correcting typo in clause 10.2 title.
Ballot statistics

- 24 respondents
  - Approve: 10
  - Disapprove: 5
  - Abstain: 9

- 21 comments from 6 commenters
  - Editorial: 5
  - Technical: 14
  - Must be satisfied: 18
Comments to be discussed

• Technical, CB-2017
  – 12
    • Minimum value of variable frerSeqRcvyHistoryLength
    • *Accept in principle*
    • Maintenance item?

• Technical
  – 20, 21
    • missing YANG and MIB subclauses
    • *Discuss*

• Editorial
  – 10, 17
    • How to specify that the length of tsnCpeMmIdMsduMatch is
    • *Accept in principle*
Comments to be discussed

• Technical, YANG
  – 1
    • Errors in YANG module (see following comments)
      • Accept in principle
  – 2, 18
    • Wrong « augment » statement’s argument
      • Accept in principle
  – 3
    • YANG warning, CBdb spec translation into YANG
      • Accept in principle
  – 4, 5
    • YANG error, CBdb spec translation into YANG
      • Accept in principle
  – 19
    • Un-augmentable node in 802.1CBcv
      • Accept in principle, discuss
Comments to be discussed

• Editorial
  – 6, 7, 14, 16, 15
    • Wrong or unclear editing instructions
    • Accept
• Editorial, CB-2017 vs. CBdb
  – 13
    • Inconsistent references to 802.1Q: -2014 in CB-2017, -2018 in CBdb
    • Accept in principle
    • Maintenance item?
• Editorial
  – 8
    • Unnecessary change bars
    • Accept
  – 9
    • Changes (byte->octet) not highlighted
    • Accept
  – 11
    • Clarity of expression (using a managed object name) of lengths in octets
    • Accept
Thank you for your attention