

Approved Responses

IEEE P802.3.2a D1.0 YANG Rev Task Force Initial Working Group ballot comments

Cl 5 SC 5.3.2.1 P60 L52 # 116

Jones, Peter Cisco
 Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **A**

We should not not be defining objects that are not specified in 802.3.
 RFC 2819 defines this as
 "The total number of packets received that were less than 64 octets long (excluding framing bits, but including FCS octets) and were otherwise well formed."
 What is the equivalent in 802.3? If there isn't one, this should be removed

SuggestedRemedy

Reference to existing or new clause 30 object(s), or remove this.

Response Response Status **U**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Add note to description regarding "Function is Deprechated "

Cl 8 SC 8.5.2 P198 L16 # 173

Jones, Peter Cisco
 Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **R**

Lots of references into clause 57, shouldn't these objects be defined in Clause 30?

SuggestedRemedy

remove cross-references to clause 57 from "references" clauses

Response Response Status **U**

REJECT.

Lack of consensus in the comment resolution group

Cl 8 SC 8.5.2 P198 L57 # 174

Jones, Peter Cisco
 Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **A**

feature remote-mib-retrieval-initiate is badly names. We are not dealing with a MIB.

SuggestedRemedy

change "-mib-" to "-data- "

Response Response Status **U**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Aling with Yangsters how to handle changed name of object

Cl 8 SC 8.5.2 P212 L2 # 178

Jones, Peter Cisco
 Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **A**

mib-retrieval is badly named. We are not dealing with a MIB.

SuggestedRemedy

change "-mib-" to "-data- "
 Change "MIB variable retrieval support." to "Variable retrieval support."

Response Response Status **U**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Need to align with yangsters on how to handle object name change