

Proposed Responses

IEEE P802.3cf D3.0 YANG Data Model Definitions Initial Sponsor ballot comments

Cl **FM** SC **FM** P1 L1 # i-18  
 Anslow, Peter Ciena Corporation  
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **D** bucket  
 "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 **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **FM** SC **FM** P2 L1 # i-19  
 Anslow, Peter Ciena Corporation  
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **D** bucket  
 The even page header in the front matter is for P802.3cc  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Make consistent with the other headers.  
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **FM** SC **FM** P7 L21 # i-20  
 Anslow, Peter Ciena Corporation  
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **D** bucket  
 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 **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **FM** SC **FM** P8 L2 # i-21  
 Anslow, Peter Ciena Corporation  
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **D** bucket  
 The first 6 names on page 8 are repeats of names on page 7.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Remove "McMillan, Larry" through "Migueluez, Phil" from the list on page 8  
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **FM** SC **FM** P10 L1 # i-22  
 Anslow, Peter Ciena Corporation  
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **D** bucket  
 The heading for "Introduction" is missing.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Add the heading  
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **FM** SC **FM** P10 L1 # i-116  
 Grow, Robert RMG Consulting  
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **D** bucket  
 The title "Introduction" is missing.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Please restore the title. (If necessary, get the templates fixed.)  
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Proposed Responses

IEEE P802.3cf D3.0 YANG Data Model Definitions Initial Sponsor ballot comments

Cl **FM** SC **FM** P10 L6 # i-117  
 Grow, Robert RMG Consulting

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

The introduction is too terse.

*SuggestedRemedy*

In consultation with the WG Chair, modify to make the Introduction 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 **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Use the following text for introduction

The YANG modules included in this standard provide YANG versions of attributes defined in IEEE Std 802.3, Clause 30, as well as derivative attributes defined in other management information bases (e.g., SNMP attributes included in IEEE Std 802.3.1, YANG versions of IETF Etherlike MIB attributes, etc.). The YANG modules defined in this standard accommodate IEEE Std 802.3-2018, excluding any currently published or future amendments. As IEEE Std 802.3 continues to evolve, new revisions of this standard may be published in the future to address new technologies and features.

Cl **FM** SC **FM** P10 L7 # i-118  
 Grow, Robert RMG Consulting

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

The 2018 revision has been published.

*SuggestedRemedy*

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

Proposed Response Response Status **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **FM** SC **FM** P10 L8 # i-119  
 Grow, Robert RMG Consulting

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

Grammar.

*SuggestedRemedy*

"results" should be "result"

Proposed Response Response Status **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **0** SC **0** P L # i-27  
 Perry, Lisa

Comment Type **G** Comment Status **D** bucket

This draft meets all editorial requirements.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Proposed Response Response Status **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Proposed Responses

IEEE P802.3cf D3.0 YANG Data Model Definitions Initial Sponsor ballot comments

Cl 1 SC 1 P1 L1 # i-244  
Mansfield, Scott

Comment Type E Comment Status D

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 W

PROPOSED REJECT.

Based on item 4 from September 2018 meeting ([http://www.ieee802.org/3/cf/public/sept18/unconfirmed\\_minutes\\_yang\\_0918.pdf](http://www.ieee802.org/3/cf/public/sept18/unconfirmed_minutes_yang_0918.pdf)), decision of TF was to stay with "ethernet" designator. 802.3 is the Ethernet Working Group, and Ethernet is a well-recognized "brand" name. Rules for YANGsters should be updated to allow {dot3 | ethernet}.

Cl 1 SC 1 P14 L4 # i-120  
Grow, Robert RMG Consulting

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

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 W

PROPOSED REJECT.

Reference in Clause 2 lists 802.3-2018 as normative version, so all references therein are interpreted as dated.

Commenter is welcome to suggest "appropriate words" - it is not clear what is excluded from the current scope as is.

Cl 1 SC 1 P14 L6 # i-121  
Grow, Robert RMG Consulting

Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket

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 W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Change "multipoint control protocol (MPCP)," to "Multipoint Control Protocol (MPCP),"

Proposed Responses

IEEE P802.3cf D3.0 YANG Data Model Definitions Initial Sponsor ballot comments

Cl 1 SC 1.3 P14 L26 # i-140  
 Cummings, Rodney National Instruments C

Comment Type GR Comment Status D

"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"](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"](https://github.com/YangModels yang/tree/master/standard/ieee/802.3/published)

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Insert editorial note with the following text:

URL: <https://github.com/YangModels yang/tree/master/standard/ieee/802.3/draft> to be replaced with [hhttps://github.com/YangModels yang/tree/master/standard/ieee/802.3/published](https://github.com/YangModels yang/tree/master/standard/ieee/802.3/published) at publication time.

Cl 1 SC 1.4 P14 L44 # i-31  
 Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies

Comment Type T Comment Status D bucket

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 W

PROPOSED REJECT.

Text already reads "NETCONF (see IETF RFC 6241) or RESTCONF (see IETF RFC 8040)."

Cl 1 SC 1.5 P14 L51 # i-32  
 Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies

Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket

There are multiple modules.

SuggestedRemedy

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

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 1 SC 1.5 P14 L63 # i-33  
 Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies

Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket

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 W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Proposed Responses

IEEE P802.3cf D3.0 YANG Data Model Definitions Initial Sponsor ballot comments

**Cl 1**      **SC 1.6**                      **P15**              **L14**              # **i-122**  
 Grow, Robert                              RMG Consulting

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

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**    **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change title of 1.6 to "YANG module syntax validation"

**Cl 1**      **SC 1.6**                      **P15**              **L18**              # **i-34**  
 Remein, Duane                              Huawei Technologies

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

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**    **W**  
 PROPOSED REJECT.

Generating such a exhaustive list will only attract comments on why specific other tools are excluded, and also become quickly outdated given the constant updates to YANG syntax. Tool examples are already listed page 15, lines 20-22.

**Cl 2**      **SC 2**                              **P16**              **L9**              # **i-139**  
 Grow, Robert                              RMG Consulting

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

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**    **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Add reference to 802.1Q-2014, update all references from 802.1D to 802.1Q (functions have been merged into 802.1Q by now).

Add reference to 802d-2017, IEEE Standard for Local and Metropolitan Area Networks:Overview and Architecture Amendment 1: Allocation of Uniform Resource Name (URN) Values in IEEE 802(R) Standards

**Cl 2**      **SC 2**                              **P16**              **L13**              # **i-1**  
 Hajduczenia, Marek                              Charter Communicatio

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

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**    **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Cl 2**      **SC 2**                              **P16**              **L13**              # **i-123**  
 Grow, Robert                              RMG Consulting

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

The Editorial Note is no longer relevant

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Remove the note.

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

## Proposed Responses

## IEEE P802.3cf D3.0 YANG Data Model Definitions Initial Sponsor ballot comments

Cl 2 SC 2 P16 L13 # i-35  
 Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies  
 Comment Type **ER** Comment Status **D** bucket  
 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 **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 2 SC 2 P16 L28 # i-36  
 Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies  
 Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **D**  
 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 **W**  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 RFC 3621 is still in force from IETF side not superseded by the IEEE Std 802.3.1

Cl 2 SC 2 P16 L30 # i-127  
 Grow, Robert RMG Consulting  
 Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **D** bucket  
 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 **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Add reference IETF RFC 3635, Definitions of Managed Objects for the Ethernet-like Interface Types, September 2003

Cl 2 SC 2 P16 L31 # i-37  
 Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies  
 Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **D** bucket  
 RFC 5246  
 Per https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/rfc8446/ RFC 5246 is obsolete.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Replace with RFC 8446  
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 2 SC 2 P16 L39 # i-38  
 Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies  
 Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **D** bucket  
 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 **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 2 SC 2 P16 L46 # i-39  
 Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies  
 Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **D** bucket  
 RFC 6536  
 Per https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/rfc6536/ RFC 6536 is obsolete.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Replace with RFC 8341  
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Proposed Responses

IEEE P802.3cf D3.0 YANG Data Model Definitions Initial Sponsor ballot comments

Cl 2 SC 2 P16 L55 # i-40  
 Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies  
 Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **D** bucket  
 RFC 7950  
 Per <https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/rfc7950/> RFC 7950 has been updated.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Add ref to RFC 8342  
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 3 SC 3 P17 L5 # i-124  
 Grow, Robert RMG Consulting  
 Comment Type **ER** Comment Status **D**  
 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 **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Insert the proposed sentence after "apply" page 17, line 4

Cl 3 SC 3.1 P17 L7 # i-41  
 Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies  
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **D** bucket  
 missing period at end of sentence.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 per comment  
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 4 SC 4 P18 L5 # i-125  
 Grow, Robert RMG Consulting  
 Comment Type **ER** Comment Status **D**  
 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 **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Use the following list of acronyms  
 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 RESTful Configuration Protocol

Proposed Responses

IEEE P802.3cf D3.0 YANG Data Model Definitions Initial Sponsor ballot comments

Cl 5 SC 5.1 P19 L14 # i-141  
 Cummings, Rodney National Instruments C  
 Comment Type GR Comment Status D  
 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 W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

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  
 supported: name, description, type, enabled, admin-status, oper-status, if-index, and phys-  
 address."

Cl 5 SC 5.2 P19 L49 # i-42  
 Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D bucket  
 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 W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Remove the Editorial Note

Cl 5 SC 5.2 P19 L50 # i-2  
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communicatio  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket  
 Unnecessary editorial note  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Remove the note on line 50-52.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 5 SC 5.2 P20 L24 # i-231  
 Weber, Karl Beckhoff Automation  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D SI  
 speed is m/s according to SI units  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change to data rate  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.

Userd consistently with IETF RFC <https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc7223> defining YANG Data  
 Model for Interface Management.

Cl 5 SC 5.2 P21 L45 # i-23  
 Anslow, Peter Ciena Corporation  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket  
 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 W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

## Proposed Responses

## IEEE P802.3cf D3.0 YANG Data Model Definitions Initial Sponsor ballot comments

**Cl 5**      **SC 5.2**                      **P22**              **L19**              # **i-126**  
 Grow, Robert                      RMG Consulting

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

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, preferably using RFC #.

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

Change title of Table 5-3 to read: "Mapping between IETF RFC 3635 managed objects and ieee802-ethernet-interface YANG data nodes"

**Cl 5**      **SC 5.3.1**                      **P24**              **L19**              # **i-232**  
 Weber, Karl                      Beckhoff Automation

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

speed is m/s according to SI units

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Change to data rate

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

See comment #i-231

**Cl 5**      **SC 5.3.2**                      **P26**              **L3**              # **i-43**  
 Remein, Duane                      Huawei Technologies

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

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**    **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Cl 5**      **SC 5.3.2**                      **P26**              **L3**              # **i-44**  
 Remein, Duane                      Huawei Technologies

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

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**    **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change "DESCRIPTION text" to "text of description for individual YANG nodes" in all Clauses.

Proposed Responses

IEEE P802.3cf D3.0 YANG Data Model Definitions Initial Sponsor ballot comments

**Cl 5 SC 5.3.2 P26 L9 # i-142**  
 Cummings, Rodney National Instruments C  
**Comment Type GR Comment Status D**  
 "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 W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 See comment #i-140

**Cl 5 SC 5.3.2 P27 L10 # i-233**  
 Weber, Karl Beckhoff Automation  
**Comment Type TR Comment Status D SI**  
 speed is m/s according to SI units  
**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Change to data rate  
**Proposed Response Response Status W**  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 See comment #i-231

**Cl 5 SC 5.3.2 P27 L17 # i-234**  
 Weber, Karl Beckhoff Automation  
**Comment Type TR Comment Status D SI**  
 speed is m/s according to SI units  
**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Change to data rate  
**Proposed Response Response Status W**  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 See comment #i-231

**Cl 5 SC 5.3.2 P30 L48 # i-235**  
 Weber, Karl Beckhoff Automation  
**Comment Type TR Comment Status D SI**  
 speed is m/s according to SI units  
**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Change to data rate  
**Proposed Response Response Status W**  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 See comment #i-231

**Cl 5 SC 5.3.2 P30 L49 # i-236**  
 Weber, Karl Beckhoff Automation  
**Comment Type TR Comment Status D SI**  
 speed is m/s according to SI units  
**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Change to data rate  
**Proposed Response Response Status W**  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 See comment #i-231

## Proposed Responses

## IEEE P802.3cf D3.0 YANG Data Model Definitions Initial Sponsor ballot comments

Cl 5 SC 5.3.2 P30 L53 # i-237  
 Weber, Karl Beckhoff Automation  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D  
 speed is m/s according to SI units  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change to data rate  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 5 SC 5.3.2 P45 L38 # i-243  
 Weber, Karl Beckhoff Automation  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D  
 speed is m/s according to SI units  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change to data rate  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 5 SC 5.3.2 P44 L49 # i-238  
 Weber, Karl Beckhoff Automation  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D  
 speed is m/s according to SI units  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change to data rate  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 5 SC 5.3.2 P46 L4 # i-240  
 Weber, Karl Beckhoff Automation  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D  
 speed is m/s according to SI units  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change to data rate  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 5 SC 5.3.2 P45 L7 # i-239  
 Weber, Karl Beckhoff Automation  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D  
 speed is m/s according to SI units  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change to data rate  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 5 SC 5.3.2 P46 L46 # i-242  
 Weber, Karl Beckhoff Automation  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D  
 speed is m/s according to SI units  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change to data rate  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 5 SC 5.3.2 P45 L37 # i-241  
 Weber, Karl Beckhoff Automation  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D  
 speed is m/s according to SI units  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change to data rate  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

## Proposed Responses

## IEEE P802.3cf D3.0 YANG Data Model Definitions Initial Sponsor ballot comments

**Cl 5**    **SC 5.3.2.1**    **P26**    **L14**    # **i-45**  
 Remein, Duane    Huawei Technologies

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

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**    **W**  
 PROPOSED REJECT.

Each YANG module should have "revision" entry to indicate when it was published. We will insert this entry when the standard is published. That is all there is to it.

**Cl 5**    **SC 5.3.2.1**    **P26**    **L44**    # **i-3**  
 Hajduczenia, Marek    Charter Communicatio

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

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**    **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Cl 5**    **SC 5.3.2.1**    **P26**    **L56**    # **i-46**  
 Remein, Duane    Huawei Technologies

**Comment Type**    **GR**    **Comment Status**    **D**

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**    **W**  
 PROPOSED REJECT.

URL will not go away, and will still live even after the project is closed. For example, .3bk is still live http://www.ieee802.org/3/bk/

**Cl 5**    **SC 5.3.2.1**    **P27**    **L10**    # **i-158**  
 Weber, Karl    Beckhoff Automation

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

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**    **W**  
 PROPOSED REJECT.

See comment #-i-231

**Cl 5**    **SC 5.3.2.1**    **P28**    **L57**    # **i-4**  
 Hajduczenia, Marek    Charter Communicatio

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

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**    **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

## Proposed Responses

## IEEE P802.3cf D3.0 YANG Data Model Definitions Initial Sponsor ballot comments

Cl 5 SC 5.3.2.1 P31 L24 # i-159  
 Weber, Karl Beckhoff Automation  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D SI  
 frames is not an unit according to the International System of Units see  
[https://www.bipm.org/utis/common/pdf/si\\_brochure\\_8\\_en.pdf](https://www.bipm.org/utis/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf)  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Delete units - line  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 Not all units used in YANG modules have to be SI compliant.

Cl 5 SC 5.3.2.1 P31 L46 # i-160  
 Weber, Karl Beckhoff Automation  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D SI  
 frames is not an unit according to the International System of Units see  
[https://www.bipm.org/utis/common/pdf/si\\_brochure\\_8\\_en.pdf](https://www.bipm.org/utis/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf)  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Delete units - line  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 See comment #i-159

Cl 5 SC 5.3.2.1 P32 L3 # i-28  
 Zhuang, Yan Huawei Technologies  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D  
 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 W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 5 SC 5.3.2.1 P32 L46 # i-161  
 Weber, Karl Beckhoff Automation  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D SI  
 frames is not an unit according to the International System of Units see  
[https://www.bipm.org/utis/common/pdf/si\\_brochure\\_8\\_en.pdf](https://www.bipm.org/utis/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf)  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Delete units - line  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 See comment #i-159

Proposed Responses

IEEE P802.3cf D3.0 YANG Data Model Definitions Initial Sponsor ballot comments

Cl 5 SC 5.3.2.1 P32 L56 # i-47  
 Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket  
 Indentation of "(IETF RFC 8343).";"  
 Same issue pg 33 line 11.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 align with rest of description  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 5 SC 5.3.2.1 P32 L65 # i-162  
 Weber, Karl Beckhoff Automation  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D SI  
 frames is not an unit according to the International System of Units see  
[https://www.bipm.org/utis/common/pdf/si\\_brochure\\_8\\_en.pdf](https://www.bipm.org/utis/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf)  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Delete units - line  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 See comment #i-159

Cl 5 SC 5.3.2.1 P33 L48 # i-163  
 Weber, Karl Beckhoff Automation  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D  
 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 W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 A pre-configured value is more useful, especially considering support for frames larger than  
 allowed by 30.3.1.1.37

Cl 5 SC 5.3.2.1 P34 L12 # i-164  
 Weber, Karl Beckhoff Automation  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket  
 fps is written differently compared to Gb/s  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change to f/s  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 5 SC 5.3.2.1 P35 L25 # i-165  
 Weber, Karl Beckhoff Automation  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D SI  
 frames is not an unit according to the International System of Units see  
[https://www.bipm.org/utis/common/pdf/si\\_brochure\\_8\\_en.pdf](https://www.bipm.org/utis/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf)  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Delete units - line  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 See comment #i-159

Cl 5 SC 5.3.2.1 P35 L54 # i-166  
 Weber, Karl Beckhoff Automation  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D SI  
 octets is not an unit according to the International System of Units see  
[https://www.bipm.org/utis/common/pdf/si\\_brochure\\_8\\_en.pdf](https://www.bipm.org/utis/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf)  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Delete units - line  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 See comment #i-159

Proposed Responses

IEEE P802.3cf D3.0 YANG Data Model Definitions Initial Sponsor ballot comments

Cl 5 SC 5.3.2.1 P35 L60 # i-167  
 Weber, Karl Beckhoff Automation  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D  
 Counts octets but FCS seems to be bytes  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change byte to octet  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
 Page information was added.

Cl 5 SC 5.3.2.1 P36 L10 # i-168  
 Weber, Karl Beckhoff Automation  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D SI  
 frames is not an unit according to the International System of Units see  
[https://www.bipm.org/utis/common/pdf/si\\_brochure\\_8\\_en.pdf](https://www.bipm.org/utis/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf)  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Delete units - line  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 See comment #i-159

Cl 5 SC 5.3.2.1 P36 L33 # i-169  
 Weber, Karl Beckhoff Automation  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D SI  
 frames is not an unit according to the International System of Units see  
[https://www.bipm.org/utis/common/pdf/si\\_brochure\\_8\\_en.pdf](https://www.bipm.org/utis/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf)  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Delete units - line  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 See comment #i-159

Cl 5 SC 5.3.2.1 P36 L60 # i-170  
 Weber, Karl Beckhoff Automation  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D SI  
 frames is not an unit according to the International System of Units see  
[https://www.bipm.org/utis/common/pdf/si\\_brochure\\_8\\_en.pdf](https://www.bipm.org/utis/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf)  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Delete units - line  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 See comment #i-159

Cl 5 SC 5.3.2.1 P37 L21 # i-171  
 Weber, Karl Beckhoff Automation  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D SI  
 frames is not an unit according to the International System of Units see  
[https://www.bipm.org/utis/common/pdf/si\\_brochure\\_8\\_en.pdf](https://www.bipm.org/utis/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf)  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Delete units - line  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 See comment #i-159

Cl 5 SC 5.3.2.1 P37 L46 # i-172  
 Weber, Karl Beckhoff Automation  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D SI  
 frames is not an unit according to the International System of Units see  
[https://www.bipm.org/utis/common/pdf/si\\_brochure\\_8\\_en.pdf](https://www.bipm.org/utis/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf)  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Delete units - line  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 See comment #i-159

Proposed Responses

IEEE P802.3cf D3.0 YANG Data Model Definitions Initial Sponsor ballot comments

Cl 5 SC 5.3.2.1 P38 L7 # i-173  
 Weber, Karl Beckhoff Automation  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D SI  
 frames is not an unit according to the International System of Units see  
[https://www.bipm.org/utis/common/pdf/si\\_brochure\\_8\\_en.pdf](https://www.bipm.org/utis/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf)  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Delete units - line  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 See comment #i-159

Cl 5 SC 5.3.2.1 P39 L17 # i-176  
 Weber, Karl Beckhoff Automation  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D SI  
 frames is not an unit according to the International System of Units see  
[https://www.bipm.org/utis/common/pdf/si\\_brochure\\_8\\_en.pdf](https://www.bipm.org/utis/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf)  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Delete units - line  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 See comment #i-159

Cl 5 SC 5.3.2.1 P38 L30 # i-174  
 Weber, Karl Beckhoff Automation  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D SI  
 frames is not an unit according to the International System of Units see  
[https://www.bipm.org/utis/common/pdf/si\\_brochure\\_8\\_en.pdf](https://www.bipm.org/utis/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf)  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Delete units - line  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 See comment #i-159

Cl 5 SC 5.3.2.1 P39 L40 # i-177  
 Weber, Karl Beckhoff Automation  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D SI  
 frames is not an unit according to the International System of Units see  
[https://www.bipm.org/utis/common/pdf/si\\_brochure\\_8\\_en.pdf](https://www.bipm.org/utis/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf)  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Delete units - line  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 See comment #i-159

Cl 5 SC 5.3.2.1 P38 L64 # i-175  
 Weber, Karl Beckhoff Automation  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D SI  
 frames is not an unit according to the International System of Units see  
[https://www.bipm.org/utis/common/pdf/si\\_brochure\\_8\\_en.pdf](https://www.bipm.org/utis/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf)  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Delete units - line  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 See comment #i-159

Cl 5 SC 5.3.2.1 P40 L37 # i-178  
 Weber, Karl Beckhoff Automation  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D SI  
 frames is not an unit according to the International System of Units see  
[https://www.bipm.org/utis/common/pdf/si\\_brochure\\_8\\_en.pdf](https://www.bipm.org/utis/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf)  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Delete units - line  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 See comment #i-159

Proposed Responses

IEEE P802.3cf D3.0 YANG Data Model Definitions Initial Sponsor ballot comments

Cl 5 SC 5.3.2.1 P41 L1 # i-179  
 Weber, Karl Beckhoff Automation  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D SI  
 transitions is not an unit according to the International System of Units see  
[https://www.bipm.org/utis/common/pdf/si\\_brochure\\_8\\_en.pdf](https://www.bipm.org/utis/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf)  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Delete units - line  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 See comment #i-159

Cl 5 SC 5.3.2.1 P41 L47 # i-180  
 Weber, Karl Beckhoff Automation  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D SI  
 transitions is not an unit according to the International System of Units see  
[https://www.bipm.org/utis/common/pdf/si\\_brochure\\_8\\_en.pdf](https://www.bipm.org/utis/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf)  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Delete units - line  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 See comment #i-159

Cl 5 SC 5.3.2.1 P42 L48 # i-182  
 Weber, Karl Beckhoff Automation  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D  
 type is counter64 while the in-discard counter is counter32  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 change to counter32  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 There should be no counter32 instances. Decision was made NOT to use 32-bit counters at all.

Cl 5 SC 5.3.2.1 P42 L49 # i-181  
 Weber, Karl Beckhoff Automation  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D SI  
 frames is not an unit according to the International System of Units see  
[https://www.bipm.org/utis/common/pdf/si\\_brochure\\_8\\_en.pdf](https://www.bipm.org/utis/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf)  
 in-discard in rfc 8343 has no units definition  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Delete units - line  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 See comment #i-159

Cl 5 SC 5.3.2.1 P43 L6 # i-183  
 Weber, Karl Beckhoff Automation  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D SI  
 frames is not an unit according to the International System of Units see  
[https://www.bipm.org/utis/common/pdf/si\\_brochure\\_8\\_en.pdf](https://www.bipm.org/utis/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf)  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Delete units - line  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 See comment #i-159

Cl 5 SC 5.3.2.2 P45 L6 # i-24  
 Anslow, Peter Ciena Corporation  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket  
 "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 W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Proposed Responses

IEEE P802.3cf D3.0 YANG Data Model Definitions Initial Sponsor ballot comments

Cl 5 SC 5.3.2.2 P45 L21 # i-148  
 Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket  
 Indentation of augment statement.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 line 19-20 is Indented by one extra level.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 5 SC 5.3.2.2 P47 L22 # i-184  
 Weber, Karl Beckhoff Automation  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D  
 frames is not an unit according to the International System of Units see  
[https://www.bipm.org/utis/common/pdf/si\\_brochure\\_8\\_en.pdf](https://www.bipm.org/utis/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf)  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Delete units - line  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 See comment #i-159

Cl 5 SC 5.3.2.2 P47 L46 # i-185  
 Weber, Karl Beckhoff Automation  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D SI  
 frames is not an unit according to the International System of Units see  
[https://www.bipm.org/utis/common/pdf/si\\_brochure\\_8\\_en.pdf](https://www.bipm.org/utis/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf)  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Delete units - line  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 See comment #i-159

Cl 5 SC 5.3.2.2 P48 L5 # i-186  
 Weber, Karl Beckhoff Automation  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D SI  
 frames is not an unit according to the International System of Units see  
[https://www.bipm.org/utis/common/pdf/si\\_brochure\\_8\\_en.pdf](https://www.bipm.org/utis/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf)  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Delete units - line  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 See comment #i-159

Cl 5 SC 5.3.2.2 P48 L25 # i-187  
 Weber, Karl Beckhoff Automation  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D SI  
 collisions is not an unit according to the International System of Units see  
[https://www.bipm.org/utis/common/pdf/si\\_brochure\\_8\\_en.pdf](https://www.bipm.org/utis/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf)  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Delete units - line  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 See comment #i-159

Cl 5 SC 5.3.2.2 P48 L49 # i-188  
 Weber, Karl Beckhoff Automation  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D SI  
 errors is not an unit according to the International System of Units see  
[https://www.bipm.org/utis/common/pdf/si\\_brochure\\_8\\_en.pdf](https://www.bipm.org/utis/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf)  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Delete units - line  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 See comment #i-159

Proposed Responses

IEEE P802.3cf D3.0 YANG Data Model Definitions Initial Sponsor ballot comments

Cl 5 SC 5.3.2.2 P49 L25 # i-189  
 Weber, Karl Beckhoff Automation  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D SI  
 collisions is not an unit according to the International System of Units see  
[https://www.bipm.org/utis/common/pdf/si\\_brochure\\_8\\_en.pdf](https://www.bipm.org/utis/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf)  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Delete units - line  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 See comment #i-159

Cl 6 SC 6.1 P50 L13 # i-49  
 Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket  
 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 W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 6 SC 6.1 P60 L15 # i-246  
 Zimmerman, George  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D 802.3bt  
 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 W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 802.3bt-2018 is out of scope for this project, as discussed multiple times. 802.3bt did not  
 make the cut to be included in 802.3-2018 release, hence it is not covered in this document.

Cl 6 SC 6.2 P50 L20 # i-50  
 Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket  
 missing verb  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change  
 "clause focused" to  
 "clause is focused"  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Proposed Responses

IEEE P802.3cf D3.0 YANG Data Model Definitions Initial Sponsor ballot comments

Cl 6 SC 6.2 P50 L21 # i-51  
 Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket  
 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 W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 6 SC 6.2 P50 L22 # i-52  
 Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket  
 "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 W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 6 SC 6.3 P50 L12 # i-129  
 Grow, Robert RMG Consulting  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket  
 First use of PD in document not expanded.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Add expansion Powered Device.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 6 SC 6.3 P51 L1 # i-128  
 Grow, Robert RMG Consulting  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D 802.3bt  
 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 W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 See comment #-i-246

Cl 6 SC 6.3 P51 L1 # i-53  
 Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket  
 Why does 6.3 warrant starting on a new page?  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Remove page break  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Proposed Responses

IEEE P802.3cf D3.0 YANG Data Model Definitions Initial Sponsor ballot comments

Cl 6 SC 6.3 P51 L5 # i-54  
 Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket  
 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 W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 6 SC 6.3 P51 L30 # i-55  
 Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket  
 Grammar  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change:  
 "and possible to encrypt their values" to:  
 "and to possibly encrypt their values"  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 6 SC 6.5.1 P60 L27 # i-156  
 Weber, Karl Beckhoff Automation  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket  
 units definition should be plural and without quoting  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 change to millijoules  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 6 SC 6.5.1 P60 L47 # i-151  
 Weber, Karl Beckhoff Automation  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D  
 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 W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Change units of actual power to milliwatts. There is no need to allow for "negative power"

Cl 6 SC 6.5.1 P60 L47 # i-152  
 Weber, Karl Beckhoff Automation  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D  
 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 W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 There is no need for signed value. No problem with the range being wider / larger.

Cl 6 SC 6.5.1 P60 L47 # i-153  
 Weber, Karl Beckhoff Automation  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket  
 units definition should be plural and without quoting  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 change to milliwatts  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

## Proposed Responses

## IEEE P802.3cf D3.0 YANG Data Model Definitions Initial Sponsor ballot comments

Cl 6 SC 6.5.1 P60 L59 # i-155  
 Weber, Karl Beckhoff Automation

Comment Type T Comment Status D

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 W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.

There is no need for signed value. No problem with the range being wider / larger.

Cl 6 SC 6.5.1 P60 L59 # i-154  
 Weber, Karl Beckhoff Automation

Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket

units definition should be plural and without quoting

SuggestedRemedy  
 change to milliwatts

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 6 SC 6.5.1 P64 L2 # i-157  
 Weber, Karl Beckhoff Automation

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

units definition missing

SuggestedRemedy  
 add "units millijoules;"

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 6 SC 6.5.1 P64 L21 # i-146  
 Weber, Karl Beckhoff Automation

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

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 W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change units of actual power to milliwatts. There is no need to allow for "negative power"

Cl 6 SC 6.5.1 P64 L21 # i-147  
 Weber, Karl Beckhoff Automation

Comment Type T Comment Status D

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 W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.

There is no need for signed value. No problem with the range being wider / larger.

Cl 6 SC 6.5.1 P64 L21 # i-148  
 Weber, Karl Beckhoff Automation

Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket

units definition should be plural and without quoting

SuggestedRemedy  
 change to milliwatts

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

## Proposed Responses

## IEEE P802.3cf D3.0 YANG Data Model Definitions Initial Sponsor ballot comments

Cl 6 SC 6.5.1 P64 L36 # i-149  
 Weber, Karl Beckhoff Automation  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket  
 units definition should be plural and without quoting  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 change to milliwatts  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 6 SC 6.5.1 P64 L36 # i-150  
 Weber, Karl Beckhoff Automation  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D  
 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 W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.

There is no need for signed value. No problem with the range being wider / larger.

Cl 6 SC 6.5.2 P54 L9 # i-143  
 Cummings, Rodney National Instruments C  
 Comment Type GR Comment Status D  
 "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 W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 See comment #i-140

Cl 6 SC 6.5.2 P61 L12 # i-56  
 Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket  
 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 W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Proposed Responses

IEEE P802.3cf D3.0 YANG Data Model Definitions Initial Sponsor ballot comments

Cl 6 SC 6.5.2 P62 L52 # i-245  
 Zimmerman, George  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D  
 "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 W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 6 SC 6.5.2 P63 L15 # i-57  
 Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket  
 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 W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 7 SC 7.2 P65 L12 # i-58  
 Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket  
 missing verb  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change  
 "clause focused" to  
 "clause is focused"  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 7 SC 7.2.1 P65 L18 # i-59  
 Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies  
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D  
 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 W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 7 SC 7.2.1 P65 L20 # i-60  
 Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D  
 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 W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Proposed Responses

IEEE P802.3cf D3.0 YANG Data Model Definitions Initial Sponsor ballot comments

Cl 7 SC 7.2.1 P65 L53 # i-61  
 Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies

Comment Type ER Comment Status D

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 IEEE 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 W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

"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 60: Physical Medium Dependent(PMD) sublayer for 1G-EPON,  
 -- Clause 64: MPCP (Multipoint Control Protocol) for 1G-EPON, and  
 -- Clause 65: Reconciliation Sublayer (RS), Physical Coding Sublayer (PCS), and Physical Media Attachment (PMA) sublayers for 1G-EPON.  
 The following clauses in IEEE Std 802.3 define 10G-EPON:  
 -- Clause 75: PMD sublayer for 10G-EPON,  
 -- Clause 76: RS, PCS, and PMA sublayers for 10G-EPON, and  
 -- Clause 77: MPCP for 10G-EPON.  
 Additionally, IEEE Std 802.3, Clause 30 and Clause 45 are also applicable to EPON.

Cl 7 SC 7.2.1 P65 L59 # i-130  
 Grow, Robert RMG Consulting

Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket

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 W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 7 SC 7.2.1 P65 L62 # i-131  
 Grow, Robert RMG Consulting

Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket

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 W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 7 SC 7.2.1 P66 L20 # i-5  
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communicatio

Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket

MPCP is already expanded and defined

SuggestedRemedy

Change  
 Clause 77: MPCP (Multipoint Control Protocol), which  
 to  
 Clause 77: MPCP, which

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

## Proposed Responses

## IEEE P802.3cf D3.0 YANG Data Model Definitions Initial Sponsor ballot comments

**Cl 7 SC 7.2.1 P66 L65 # i-133**  
 Grow, Robert RMG Consulting  
**Comment Type E Comment Status D** bucket  
 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 variant, RS-FEC a quick check of expansions in the document mostly uses the uncapitalized version).  
**Proposed Response Response Status W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Add expansion Forward Error Correction - we just need to be consistent in our document  
 Page number fixed (should be 66, line 65)

**Cl 7 SC 7.2.1 P76 L1 # i-132**  
 Grow, Robert RMG Consulting  
**Comment Type E Comment Status D** bucket  
 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 W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Cl 7 SC 7.2.2 P66 L24 # i-62**  
 Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies  
**Comment Type TR Comment Status D**  
 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 W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 See comment #i-7

**Cl 7 SC 7.2.2 P66 L24 # i-7**  
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communicatio  
**Comment Type TR Comment Status D**  
 \*\*\* 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 W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Cl 7 SC 7.2.2 P66 L28 # i-6**  
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communicatio  
**Comment Type E Comment Status D** bucket  
 Missing comma after "802.3"  
**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Per comment  
**Proposed Response Response Status W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Cl 7 SC 7.2.2 P67 L1 # i-8**  
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communicatio  
**Comment Type T Comment Status D**  
 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 W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

## Proposed Responses

## IEEE P802.3cf D3.0 YANG Data Model Definitions Initial Sponsor ballot comments

**Cl 7 SC 7.2.3 P67 L1 # i-63**  
 Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies

**Comment Type TR Comment Status D**

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 W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #i-8

**Cl 7 SC 7.2.3 P67 L34 # i-134**  
 Grow, Robert RMG Consulting

**Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket**

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 W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Cl 7 SC 7.2.3 P67 L38 # i-135**  
 Grow, Robert RMG Consulting

**Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket**

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

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Change to: time-division multiple access.

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

**Cl 7 SC 7.2.4 P67 L44 # i-9**  
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communicatio

**Comment Type TR Comment Status D**

\*\*\* Comment submitted with the file 9831780003-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 W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Cl 7 SC 7.2.4 P67 L44 # i-64**  
 Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies

**Comment Type ER Comment Status D**

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 W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #i-9

**Cl 7 SC 7.2.5 P67 L57 # i-65**  
 Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies

**Comment Type ER Comment Status D**

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 W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Proposed Responses

IEEE P802.3cf D3.0 YANG Data Model Definitions Initial Sponsor ballot comments

**Cl 7 SC 7.2.6 P68 L61 # i-10**  
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communicatio

**Comment Type TR Comment Status D**  
 \*\*\* 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 W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Cl 7 SC 7.2.6 P69 L3 # i-67**  
 Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies

**Comment Type E Comment Status D**  
 "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 W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Cl 7 SC 7.2.6 P69 L45 # i-68**  
 Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies

**Comment Type TR Comment Status D**  
 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 W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment i-10

**Cl 7 SC 7.2.6 P69 L63 # i-69**  
 Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies

**Comment Type TR Comment Status D**  
 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 W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #-i-10

**Cl 7 SC 7.2.6 P70 L50 # i-70**  
 Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies

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

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 per comment

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

**Cl 7 SC 7.2.6 P70 L55 # i-71**  
 Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies

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

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 per comment

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

## Proposed Responses

## IEEE P802.3cf D3.0 YANG Data Model Definitions Initial Sponsor ballot comments

**Cl 7 SC 7.2.6 P70 L60 # i-72**  
 Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies  
**Comment Type E Comment Status D**  
 "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 W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 See comment #i-10

**Cl 7 SC 7.2.7 P71 L1 # i-73**  
 Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies  
**Comment Type TR Comment Status D**  
 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 W**  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 Similar material was found useful in 802.3.1

**Cl 7 SC 7.2.8 P72 L17 # i-74**  
 Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies  
**Comment Type T Comment Status D**  
 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 W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Cl 7 SC 7.3 P75 L57 # i-25**  
 Anslow, Peter Ciena Corporation  
**Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket**  
 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 W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Cl 7 SC 7.4.2 P68 L1 # i-66**  
 Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies  
**Comment Type ER Comment Status D**  
 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 W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Cl 7 SC 7.4.2 P76 L50 # i-75**  
 Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies  
**Comment Type G Comment Status D bucket**  
 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 W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

## Proposed Responses

## IEEE P802.3cf D3.0 YANG Data Model Definitions Initial Sponsor ballot comments

Cl 7 SC 7.4.2 P79 L8 # i-144  
 Cummings, Rodney National Instruments C

Comment Type GR Comment Status D

"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"](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"](https://github.com/YangModels/yang/tree/master/standard/ieee/802.3/published)

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #i-140

Cl 7 SC 7.4.2 P80 L15 # i-76  
 Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies

Comment Type E Comment Status D

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 W

PROPOSED REJECT.

Current module will not be reusable for 25xG-EPON, given a completelt different logical link structure, granting, etc. It will be cleaned to have a new, optimised Nx25G-EPON module and avoid all luggage from previosu generations.

Cl 7 SC 7.4.2 P80 L20 # i-11  
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communicatio

Comment Type T Comment Status D

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 W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 7 SC 7.4.2 P81 L34 # i-12  
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communicatio

Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket

"mpcp" should be all caps

## SuggestedRemedy

Change "mpcp" to "MPCP"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 7 SC 7.4.2 P81 L64 # i-13  
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communicatio

Comment Type T Comment Status D bucket

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 W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Proposed Responses

IEEE P802.3cf D3.0 YANG Data Model Definitions Initial Sponsor ballot comments

Cl 7 SC 7.4.2 P84 L34 # i-15  
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communicatio  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D  
 Confusing description of typedef trx-admin-state  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change description to read:  
 When read as 'disabled', the transmitter is currently disabled (not transmitting).  
 When set to 'disabled', the transmitter is expected to be disabled (stop transmitting)  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 7 SC 7.4.2 P84 L57 # i-14  
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communicatio  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket  
 Empty reference field  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Strike  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 7 SC 7.4.2 P84 L57 # i-77  
 Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D bucket  
 It seems odd to have a blank Reference  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change "" to "Not Applicable"  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 See comment #-i-14

Cl 7 SC 7.4.2 P84 L64 # i-78  
 Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies  
 Comment Type GR Comment Status D  
 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 W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 7 SC 7.4.2 P86 L10 # i-79  
 Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket  
 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 W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 7 SC 7.4.2 P86 L23 # i-80  
 Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket  
 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 W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Proposed Responses

IEEE P802.3cf D3.0 YANG Data Model Definitions Initial Sponsor ballot comments

Cl 7 SC 7.4.2 P86 L64 # i-81  
 Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D  
 leaf fec-mode {  
 Why is this statement here? "It has a distinct value for each logical link."? FEC is not configurable on an lld by lld basis  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change:  
 "It has a distinct value ..." to:  
 "This object has the same value ..."  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 7 SC 7.4.2 P88 L21 # i-82  
 Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D  
 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 it 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 W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Change:  
 "It has a distinct value ..." to:  
 "At the OLT, this object has a distinct value ..."  
 (added missing comma)

Cl 7 SC 7.4.2 P88 L37 # i-83  
 Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket  
 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 W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Change to "This container includes all Ethernet interface-specific capabilities."  
 (added missing hyphen)

Cl 7 SC 7.4.2 P88 L63 # i-190  
 Weber, Karl Beckhoff Automation  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D SI  
 frames is not an unit according to the International System of Units see [https://www.bipm.org/utis/common/pdf/si\\_brochure\\_8\\_en.pdf](https://www.bipm.org/utis/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf)  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Delete units - line  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 See comment #-i-159

Cl 7 SC 7.4.2 P89 L27 # i-191  
 Weber, Karl Beckhoff Automation  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D SI  
 frames is not an unit according to the International System of Units see [https://www.bipm.org/utis/common/pdf/si\\_brochure\\_8\\_en.pdf](https://www.bipm.org/utis/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf)  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Delete units - line  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 See comment #-i-159

Proposed Responses

IEEE P802.3cf D3.0 YANG Data Model Definitions Initial Sponsor ballot comments

Cl 7 SC 7.4.2 P89 L58 # i-192  
 Weber, Karl Beckhoff Automation  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D SI  
 frames is not an unit according to the International System of Units see  
[https://www.bipm.org/utis/common/pdf/si\\_brochure\\_8\\_en.pdf](https://www.bipm.org/utis/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf)  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Delete units - line  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 See comment #i-159

Cl 7 SC 7.4.2 P90 L4 # i-84  
 Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D  
 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 W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 7 SC 7.4.2 P90 L9 # i-86  
 Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket  
 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 W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 7 SC 7.4.2 P90 L22 # i-193  
 Weber, Karl Beckhoff Automation  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D  
 discovery timeout is not an unit according to the International System of Units see  
[https://www.bipm.org/utis/common/pdf/si\\_brochure\\_8\\_en.pdf](https://www.bipm.org/utis/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf)  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Delete units - line  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Proposed Responses

IEEE P802.3cf D3.0 YANG Data Model Definitions Initial Sponsor ballot comments

Cl 7 SC 7.4.2 P90 L34 # i-85  
 Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D  
 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 W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 7 SC 7.4.2 P90 L64 # i-87  
 Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D  
 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 W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 7 SC 7.4.2 P90 L51 # i-194  
 Weber, Karl Beckhoff Automation  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D SI  
 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](https://www.bipm.org/utils/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf)  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Delete units - line  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 See comment #i-159

Cl 7 SC 7.4.2 P91 L16 # i-195  
 Weber, Karl Beckhoff Automation  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D SI  
 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](https://www.bipm.org/utils/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf)  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Delete units - line  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 See comment #i-159

Proposed Responses

IEEE P802.3cf D3.0 YANG Data Model Definitions Initial Sponsor ballot comments

Cl 7 SC 7.4.2 P91 L30 # i-88  
 Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D  
 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 W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 7 SC 7.4.2 P91 L47 # i-196  
 Weber, Karl Beckhoff Automation  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D SI  
 frames is not an unit according to the International System of Units see  
[https://www.bipm.org/utis/common/pdf/si\\_brochure\\_8\\_en.pdf](https://www.bipm.org/utis/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf)  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Delete units - line  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 See comment #i-159

Cl 7 SC 7.4.2 P91 L60 # i-89  
 Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D  
 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 W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 7 SC 7.4.2 P92 L11 # i-197  
 Weber, Karl Beckhoff Automation  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D SI  
 frames is not an unit according to the International System of Units see  
[https://www.bipm.org/utis/common/pdf/si\\_brochure\\_8\\_en.pdf](https://www.bipm.org/utis/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf)  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Delete units - line  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 See comment #i-159

Proposed Responses

IEEE P802.3cf D3.0 YANG Data Model Definitions Initial Sponsor ballot comments

CI 7 SC 7.4.2 P92 L24 # i-90  
 Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

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/leaves (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 W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 7 SC 7.4.2 P92 L42 # i-198  
 Weber, Karl Beckhoff Automation

Comment Type E Comment Status D SI

frames is not an unit according to the International System of Units see  
[https://www.bipm.org/utis/common/pdf/si\\_brochure\\_8\\_en.pdf](https://www.bipm.org/utis/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf)

SuggestedRemedy

Delete units - line

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.

See comment #i-159

CI 7 SC 7.4.2 P92 L55 # i-91  
 Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

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 W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 7 SC 7.4.2 P93 L6 # i-199  
 Weber, Karl Beckhoff Automation

Comment Type E Comment Status D SI

frames is not an unit according to the International System of Units see  
[https://www.bipm.org/utis/common/pdf/si\\_brochure\\_8\\_en.pdf](https://www.bipm.org/utis/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf)

SuggestedRemedy

Delete units - line

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.

See comment #i-159

CI 7 SC 7.4.2 P93 L37 # i-200  
 Weber, Karl Beckhoff Automation

Comment Type E Comment Status D SI

frames is not an unit according to the International System of Units see  
[https://www.bipm.org/utis/common/pdf/si\\_brochure\\_8\\_en.pdf](https://www.bipm.org/utis/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf)

SuggestedRemedy

Delete units - line

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.

See comment #i-159

Proposed Responses

IEEE P802.3cf D3.0 YANG Data Model Definitions Initial Sponsor ballot comments

Cl 7 SC 7.4.2 P93 L58 # i-16  
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communicatio  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D  
 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 W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 7 SC 7.4.2 P94 L3 # i-201  
 Weber, Karl Beckhoff Automation  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D SI  
 frames is not an unit according to the International System of Units see  
[https://www.bipm.org/utis/common/pdf/si\\_brochure\\_8\\_en.pdf](https://www.bipm.org/utis/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf)  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Delete units - line  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
  
 See comment #i-159

Cl 7 SC 7.4.2 P94 L16 # i-92  
 Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D  
 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 W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 7 SC 7.4.2 P94 L33 # i-202  
 Weber, Karl Beckhoff Automation  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D SI  
 frames is not an unit according to the International System of Units see  
[https://www.bipm.org/utis/common/pdf/si\\_brochure\\_8\\_en.pdf](https://www.bipm.org/utis/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf)  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Delete units - line  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
  
 See comment #i-159

Cl 7 SC 7.4.2 P94 L64 # i-203  
 Weber, Karl Beckhoff Automation  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D SI  
 frames is not an unit according to the International System of Units see  
[https://www.bipm.org/utis/common/pdf/si\\_brochure\\_8\\_en.pdf](https://www.bipm.org/utis/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf)  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Delete units - line  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
  
 See comment #i-159

Cl 7 SC 7.4.2 P95 L12 # i-93  
 Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

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 W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 7 SC 7.4.2 P95 L39 # i-204  
 Weber, Karl Beckhoff Automation

Comment Type E Comment Status D SI

frames is not an unit according to the International System of Units see  
[https://www.bipm.org/utis/common/pdf/si\\_brochure\\_8\\_en.pdf](https://www.bipm.org/utis/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf)

SuggestedRemedy  
 Delete units - line

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.

See comment #i-159

Cl 7 SC 7.4.2 P95 L45 # i-94  
 Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

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 W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.

These counters have nothing to do with MPCP-only frames. They are part of oOMPEmulation object in 802.3, under oPAF and derived from oPHYEntity. oMPCP is derived from oMACControlEntity and belongs to a different and separate tree.

Cl 7 SC 7.4.2 P96 L1 # i-205  
 Weber, Karl Beckhoff Automation

Comment Type E Comment Status D SI

frames is not an unit according to the International System of Units see  
[https://www.bipm.org/utis/common/pdf/si\\_brochure\\_8\\_en.pdf](https://www.bipm.org/utis/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf)

SuggestedRemedy  
 Delete units - line

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.

See comment #i-159

Cl 7 SC 7.4.2 P96 L27 # i-206  
 Weber, Karl Beckhoff Automation

Comment Type E Comment Status D SI

frames is not an unit according to the International System of Units see  
[https://www.bipm.org/utis/common/pdf/si\\_brochure\\_8\\_en.pdf](https://www.bipm.org/utis/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf)

SuggestedRemedy  
 Delete units - line

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.

See comment #i-159

Proposed Responses

IEEE P802.3cf D3.0 YANG Data Model Definitions Initial Sponsor ballot comments

Cl 7 SC 7.4.2 P96 L35 # i-17  
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communicatio  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket  
 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 W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 7 SC 7.4.2 P96 L45 # i-95  
 Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D  
 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 W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 7 SC 7.4.2 P96 L46 # i-96  
 Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket  
 "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 W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 7 SC 7.4.2 P96 L58 # i-97  
 Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D  
 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 W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 7 SC 7.4.2 P96 L61 # i-207  
 Weber, Karl Beckhoff Automation  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D SI  
 frames is not an unit according to the International System of Units see  
[https://www.bipm.org/utis/common/pdf/si\\_brochure\\_8\\_en.pdf](https://www.bipm.org/utis/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf)  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Delete units - line  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 See comment #-i-159

Cl 7 SC 7.4.2 P97 L29 # i-208  
 Weber, Karl Beckhoff Automation  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D SI  
 frames is not an unit according to the International System of Units see  
[https://www.bipm.org/utis/common/pdf/si\\_brochure\\_8\\_en.pdf](https://www.bipm.org/utis/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf)  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Delete units - line  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 See comment #-i-159

Proposed Responses

IEEE P802.3cf D3.0 YANG Data Model Definitions Initial Sponsor ballot comments

Cl 7 SC 7.4.2 P97 L41 # i-98  
 Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

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 W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 7 SC 7.4.2 P97 L57 # i-209  
 Weber, Karl Beckhoff Automation

Comment Type E Comment Status D SI

frames is not an unit according to the International System of Units see  
[https://www.bipm.org/utis/common/pdf/si\\_brochure\\_8\\_en.pdf](https://www.bipm.org/utis/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf)

SuggestedRemedy  
 Delete units - line

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.

See comment #i-159

Cl 7 SC 7.4.2 P98 L20 # i-210  
 Weber, Karl Beckhoff Automation

Comment Type E Comment Status D SI

frames is not an unit according to the International System of Units see  
[https://www.bipm.org/utis/common/pdf/si\\_brochure\\_8\\_en.pdf](https://www.bipm.org/utis/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf)

SuggestedRemedy  
 Delete units - line

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.

See comment #i-159

Cl 7 SC 7.4.2 P98 L49 # i-211  
 Weber, Karl Beckhoff Automation

Comment Type E Comment Status D SI

frames is not an unit according to the International System of Units see  
[https://www.bipm.org/utis/common/pdf/si\\_brochure\\_8\\_en.pdf](https://www.bipm.org/utis/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf)

SuggestedRemedy  
 Delete units - line

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.

See comment #i-159

Cl 7 SC 7.4.2 P99 L16 # i-212  
 Weber, Karl Beckhoff Automation

Comment Type E Comment Status D SI

frames is not an unit according to the International System of Units see  
[https://www.bipm.org/utis/common/pdf/si\\_brochure\\_8\\_en.pdf](https://www.bipm.org/utis/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf)

SuggestedRemedy  
 Delete units - line

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.

See comment #i-159

Proposed Responses

IEEE P802.3cf D3.0 YANG Data Model Definitions Initial Sponsor ballot comments

Cl 7 SC 7.4.2 P99 L33 # i-99  
 Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket  
 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 W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 7 SC 7.4.2 P99 L47 # i-213  
 Weber, Karl Beckhoff Automation  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D SI  
 frames is not an unit according to the International System of Units see [https://www.bipm.org/utis/common/pdf/si\\_brochure\\_8\\_en.pdf](https://www.bipm.org/utis/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf)  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Delete units - line  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 See comment #-i-159

Cl 7 SC 7.4.2 P100 L14 # i-214  
 Weber, Karl Beckhoff Automation  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D SI  
 frames is not an unit according to the International System of Units see [https://www.bipm.org/utis/common/pdf/si\\_brochure\\_8\\_en.pdf](https://www.bipm.org/utis/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf)  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Delete units - line  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 See comment #-i-159

Cl 7 SC 7.4.2 P100 L58 # i-215  
 Weber, Karl Beckhoff Automation  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D SI  
 frames is not an unit according to the International System of Units see [https://www.bipm.org/utis/common/pdf/si\\_brochure\\_8\\_en.pdf](https://www.bipm.org/utis/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf)  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Delete units - line  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 See comment #-i-159

Cl 7 SC 7.4.2 P105 L2 # i-100  
 Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D  
 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 W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.

Current statement is correct, i.e., the value is measured continuously for the duration of a burst and reported on. Measurement is done on per-burst basis, and correlated to a specific LLID for reporting.

Cl 7 SC 7.4.2 P106 L24 # i-216  
 Weber, Karl Beckhoff Automation  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D SI  
 code-group is not an unit according to the International System of Units see [https://www.bipm.org/utis/common/pdf/si\\_brochure\\_8\\_en.pdf](https://www.bipm.org/utis/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf)  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Delete units - line  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 See comment #-i-159

Proposed Responses

IEEE P802.3cf D3.0 YANG Data Model Definitions Initial Sponsor ballot comments

Cl 7 SC 7.4.2 P106 L29 # i-101  
 Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D  
 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 W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 7 SC 7.4.2 P106 L56 # i-217  
 Weber, Karl Beckhoff Automation  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D SI  
 code-group is not an unit according to the International System of Units see  
[https://www.bipm.org/utis/common/pdf/si\\_brochure\\_8\\_en.pdf](https://www.bipm.org/utis/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf)  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Delete units - line  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 See comment #i-159

Cl 7 SC 7.4.2 P106 L61 # i-102  
 Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D  
 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 W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Change the first para to read:  
 "For 1G-EPON 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."  
 (Replaced 1000BASE-PX with 1G-EPON)

Cl 7 SC 7.4.2 P107 L21 # i-218  
 Weber, Karl Beckhoff Automation  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D SI  
 code-group is not an unit according to the International System of Units see  
[https://www.bipm.org/utis/common/pdf/si\\_brochure\\_8\\_en.pdf](https://www.bipm.org/utis/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf)  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Delete units - line  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 See comment #i-159

## Proposed Responses

## IEEE P802.3cf D3.0 YANG Data Model Definitions Initial Sponsor ballot comments

Cl 7 SC 7.4.2 P107 L50 # i-219  
 Weber, Karl Beckhoff Automation  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D SI  
 code-group is not an unit according to the International System of Units see  
[https://www.bipm.org/utis/common/pdf/si\\_brochure\\_8\\_en.pdf](https://www.bipm.org/utis/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf)  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Delete units - line  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 See comment #i-159

Cl 7 SC 7.4.2 P109 L6 # i-103  
 Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket  
 Change "in to" to "to"  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 per comment  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 7 SC 7.4.2 P110 L3 # i-104  
 Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket  
 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 W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Change:  
 "It has a distinct value for each logical link and every queue." to:  
 "At the OLT, this object has a distinct value for each logical link and every queue."  
 (replaced "it" with ", this object")

Cl 7 SC 7.4.2 P110 L35 # i-105  
 Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket  
 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 W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 7 SC 7.4.2 P113 L40 # i-220  
 Weber, Karl Beckhoff Automation  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D SI  
 TQ is not an unit according to the International System of Units see  
[https://www.bipm.org/utis/common/pdf/si\\_brochure\\_8\\_en.pdf](https://www.bipm.org/utis/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf)  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Delete units - line  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 See comment #i-159

Cl 7 SC 7.4.2 P114 L21 # i-106  
 Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D  
 leaf in-mcp-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 W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

## Proposed Responses

## IEEE P802.3cf D3.0 YANG Data Model Definitions Initial Sponsor ballot comments

Cl 7 SC 7.4.2 P115 L19 # i-107  
 Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket  
 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 W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 7 SC 7.4.2 P116 L32 # i-221  
 Weber, Karl Beckhoff Automation  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D SI  
 TQ (16ns) is not an unit according to the International System of Units see [https://www.bipm.org/utis/common/pdf/si\\_brochure\\_8\\_en.pdf](https://www.bipm.org/utis/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf)  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Delete units - line  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 See comment #i-159

Cl 7 SC 7.4.2 P116 L42 # i-30  
 Zhuang, Yan Huawei Technologies  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D  
 There are 8 shall statements in the descriptions of mpcp-related objects. I do not suppose these are intended as mandatr requirements here.  
 --from Glen Kramer  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 search and replace without using the word "shall"  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 7 SC 7.4.2 P116 L50 # i-108  
 Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D  
 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 W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 7 SC 7.4.2 P116 L65 # i-109  
 Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket  
 There is no cable in EPON "is cable of supporting"  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change cable to capable  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 7 SC 7.4.2 P118 L18 # i-223  
 Weber, Karl Beckhoff Automation  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D SI  
 TQ (16ns) is not an unit according to the International System of Units see [https://www.bipm.org/utis/common/pdf/si\\_brochure\\_8\\_en.pdf](https://www.bipm.org/utis/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf)  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Delete units - line  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 See comment #i-159

## Proposed Responses

## IEEE P802.3cf D3.0 YANG Data Model Definitions Initial Sponsor ballot comments

Cl 7 SC 7.4.2 P118 L44 # i-222  
 Weber, Karl Beckhoff Automation  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D SI  
 TQ (16ns) is not an unit according to the International System of Units see  
[https://www.bipm.org/utis/common/pdf/si\\_brochure\\_8\\_en.pdf](https://www.bipm.org/utis/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf)  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Delete units - line  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 See comment #i-159

Cl 7 SC 7.4.2 P119 L5 # i-224  
 Weber, Karl Beckhoff Automation  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D SI  
 TQ (16ns) is not an unit according to the International System of Units see  
[https://www.bipm.org/utis/common/pdf/si\\_brochure\\_8\\_en.pdf](https://www.bipm.org/utis/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf)  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Delete units - line  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 See comment #i-159

Cl 7 SC 7.4.2 P119 L20 # i-110  
 Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D  
 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 W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 7 SC 7.4.2 P119 L38 # i-111  
 Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D  
 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 W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 This comment is against "mpcp-maximum-grant-count" node.  
 After leaf mpcp-maximum-grant-count { 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.;"

Cl 7 SC 7.4.2 P120 L1 # i-112  
 Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket  
 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 W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Proposed Responses

IEEE P802.3cf D3.0 YANG Data Model Definitions Initial Sponsor ballot comments

Cl 7 SC 7.4.2 P120 L20 # i-113  
 Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies

Comment Type TR Comment Status D  
 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 W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 7 SC 7.4.2 P142 L18 # i-227  
 Weber, Karl Beckhoff Automation

Comment Type T Comment Status D  
 uint64 is too large

SuggestedRemedy  
 restrict to uint16

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 7 SC 7.4.2 P142 L18 # i-226  
 Weber, Karl Beckhoff Automation

Comment Type T Comment Status D  
 Is not mtu but pdu

SuggestedRemedy  
 change to oammtu

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 7 SC 7.4.2 P142 L20 # i-225  
 Weber, Karl Beckhoff Automation

Comment Type E Comment Status D  
 bytes is not an unit according to the International System of Units see  
[https://www.bipm.org/utis/common/pdf/si\\_brochure\\_8\\_en.pdf](https://www.bipm.org/utis/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf)

SuggestedRemedy  
 Delete units - line

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change bytes to octets

Cl 7 SC 7.4.2 P145 L28 # i-230  
 Weber, Karl Beckhoff Automation

Comment Type T Comment Status D  
 uint64 is too large

SuggestedRemedy  
 restrict to uint16

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 7 SC 7.4.2 P145 L28 # i-229  
 Weber, Karl Beckhoff Automation

Comment Type T Comment Status D  
 Is not mtu but pdu

SuggestedRemedy  
 change to oammtu

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

## Proposed Responses

## IEEE P802.3cf D3.0 YANG Data Model Definitions Initial Sponsor ballot comments

**Cl 7**    **SC 7.4.2**                      **P145**    **L29**                      # **i-228**  
 Weber, Karl                              Beckhoff Automation

**Comment Type**    **E**                      **Comment Status**    **D**    **SI**

bytes is not an unit according to the International System of Units see  
[https://www.bipm.org/utis/common/pdf/si\\_brochure\\_8\\_en.pdf](https://www.bipm.org/utis/common/pdf/si_brochure_8_en.pdf)

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Delete units - line

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

Change bytes to octets

**Cl 8**    **SC 8.2.4**                      **P122**    **L3**                      # **i-136**  
 Grow, Robert                              RMG Consulting

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

The expansion and acronym for OAMPDU are not closely enough linked.

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Add "(OAMPDU)" after "Ethernet OAM protocol data unit".

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

**Cl 8**    **SC 8.3**                              **P122**    **L46**                      # **i-137**  
 Grow, Robert                              RMG Consulting

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

Netconf/Restconf are not capitalized in this case.

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 NETCONF/RESTCONF

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

**Cl 8**    **SC 8.3.**                              **P122**    **L46**                      # **i-114**  
 Remein, Duane                              Huawei Technologies

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

Capitalization "Netconf/Restconf" should be in all caps

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 per comment

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

**Cl 8**    **SC 8.4**                              **P126**    **L46**                      # **i-26**  
 Anslow, Peter                              Ciena Corporation

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

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**    **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Cl 8**    **SC 8.5.2**                              **P130**    **L9**                      # **i-145**  
 Cummings, Rodney                              National Instruments C

**Comment Type**    **GR**                      **Comment Status**    **D**

"<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**    **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #-i-140

Proposed Responses

IEEE P802.3cf D3.0 YANG Data Model Definitions Initial Sponsor ballot comments

Cl 8 SC 8.5.2 P135 L56 # i-138  
 Grow, Robert RMG Consulting

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

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 W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The length is correct as it is, i.e., AA:BB:CC occupies 6 + 2 characters total (AABBCC + two instances of ":").

Update reference to IEEE Std 802-2014, Clause 9.

Cl 8 SC 8.5.2 P143 L23 # i-115  
 Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies

Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket

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 W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 8 SC 8.5.2 P150 L17 # i-29  
 Zhuang, Yan Huawei Technologies

Comment Type T Comment Status D

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 W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Replace ""This leaf will never be set to 'threshold-event-type.'"; with

"This leaf is not set to 'threshold-event-type.'";