<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Type</th>
<th>Comment Status</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Proposed Response</th>
<th>Suggested Remedy</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Response Status</th>
<th>Comment Status</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Proposed Response</th>
<th>Suggested Remedy</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Response Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TR</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Jones, Peter</td>
<td>I've created a new ieee802-ethernet-mau.yang module to provide similar functionality to ianamau-mib.mib and added some of the MAU related information in ieee802-ethernet-interface.yang. I will present this to the group in Denver.</td>
<td>Add the draft ieee802-ethernet-mau.yang module into the draft.</td>
<td>REJECT.</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Jones, Peter</td>
<td>Please use the pyang utility to produce a common structure/format for the YANG modules. I have drafted a procedure document (802.3 management interface process_0_0.docx) that I intend to review with the group in Denver, including looking at the before and after YANG Text.</td>
<td>Use proposed tools to programatically format the YANG files for consistency</td>
<td>ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Ran, Adee</td>
<td>minor changes from D1.1. Diffs attached.</td>
<td>Please make the changes shown in the yang-diffs-peter-jones.txt file</td>
<td>ACCEPT.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

Suggested Remedy to change the quoted text to:
"data terminal equipment (DTE) using either half-duplex Carrier Sense Multiple Access/Collision Detection (CSMA/CD), full-duplex point-to-point communication, or Multipoint Control Protocol (MPCP)."

Response to change Chapter 1. Overview to:
"This standard defines YANG modules for various Ethernet functions specified in IEEE Std 802.3."
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Type</th>
<th>Comment Status</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ran, Adee Cisco

Type: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required

Comment Type: E
Comment Status: A

"may be considered sensitive or vulnerable in some network environments"

"may" has a special meaning in standard language, and is arguably not the right word here; anything _may_ be considered vulnerable somewhere. The sentence seems to suggest that these objects _are_ considered sensitive in some environments.

Several similar statements appear in multiple places in the document (I counted 8 instances of "may be considered sensitive").

**Suggested Remedy**

Change to "are considered sensitive or vulnerable in some network environments".

Change other instances similarly.

**Response**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

With response alignment with IEEE 802.3.1b

Change all instances of "may be considered sensitive or vulnerable in some network environments"

To

"can considered sensitive or vulnerable in some network environments".

---

Ran, Adee Cisco

Type: ER/editorial required

Comment Type: E
Comment Status: R

listing text in landscape orientation is inefficient. It seems that the orientation can be changed to portrait and with deletion of some white spaces occasionally there will be no wraparound. The text will be somewhat easier to view this way.

**Suggested Remedy**

Change to portrait and remove white space if necessary.

**Response**

REJECT.

It is not possible to resize the text which is auto generated and imported by references in a way to allow for none wrapping lines.

---

Ran, Adee Cisco

Type: TR/technical required

Comment Type: E
Comment Status: A

Most of the tables that are in landscape orientation have a lot of white space. It seems that the orientation can be changed to portrait and with some resizing of columns there will be no wraparound (and even if there is it's not a real problem). The tables will be somewhat easier to view this way.

**Suggested Remedy**

Change to portrait and resize columns if necessary.

**Response**

REJECT.

It is not possible to resize the columns in a way to allow for none wrapping lines for all YANG modules.

---

Ran, Adee Cisco

Type: ER/editorial required

Comment Type: E
Comment Status: R

Subclause 7.2 is titled "YANG module structure" but its content is a detailed overview of the EPON technology and its history.

This is in contrast to 5.1, the corresponding "structure" subclause for the Ethernet YANG module, which does indeed describe the structure (without trying to explain Ethernet or its history).

It seems that most of the content of 7.2 should go into the introduction in 7.1 instead, or alternatively be deleted.

**Suggested Remedy**

Make 7.2 structure similar to that of 5.1, moving the overview content to 7.1 if necessary.

**Response**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Will restructure to match clause structure of IEEE 802.3.1

---

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required

COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected

RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn

SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.2.1</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ran</td>
<td>Ade</td>
<td>Cisco</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment**

There is also Nx25G-EPON in Clause 141. If it is relevant, it should be added to the list (and corresponding changes should be made to the clause text). Otherwise, it should be explicitly excluded.

**Suggested Remedy**

Per comment

**Response**

REJECT.

Since Ns25G-EPON is not referenced, it is not covered. We do not want to list what is NOT included (the list would be very long for each module) and rather just list what is included, as covered by Clause 7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.4.2</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ran</td>
<td>Ade</td>
<td>Cisco</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment**

*should any discrepancy between the text of the description for individual YANG nodes and the corresponding definition in 7.2 through 7.4 of this clause occur, the definitions and mappings in 7.4 shall take precedence*

7.4 itself only points to RFC 8407. Since 7.4.2 is within 7.4, it is unclear what potential discrepancy is addressed here, and what takes precedence over what.

**Suggested Remedy**

Clarify.

**Response**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Remove text in Clause 7.4.2 page 138 row 3 thorough 6

"In the following YANG module definition, should any discrepancy between the text of the description for individual YANG nodes and the corresponding definition in 7.2 through 7.4 of this clause occur, the definitions and mappings in 7.4 shall take precedence."

For alignment remove similar text construct in other subclauses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.4.2</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ran</td>
<td>Ade</td>
<td>Cisco</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment**

footnote number is 0

**Suggested Remedy**

fix it

**Response**

ACCEPT.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CI</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ran, Adee</td>
<td>Cisco</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment Type:** E  **Comment Status:** A

The acronym "ELO" appears only once, here in the clause heading, and then in the acronym list. It is not used in the 802.3 standard at all. Apparently it isn't helpful in this context.

**SuggestedRemedy**

Delete the acronym here and in the list. Consider renaming to "Ethernet OAM".

**Response**  **Response Status:** C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Remove the abrivation ELO from heading and abrivation list

Change text from

"YANG module for Ethernet Link OAM (ELO)"

TO

"YANG module for Ethernet Link OAM"

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CI</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ran, Adee</td>
<td>Cisco</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment Type:** T  **Comment Status:** R

Clause 8 relates to OAM as if it is a specific feature of Clause 57.

There are other flavors of Ethernet that include OAM. In 802.3-2022, OAM is mentioned in clauses 97, 115, and 149. It seems that these clauses are also relevant here.

If clause 8 is specific to the OAM in clause 57 of 802.3 and not to other usages of this term, then some clarification that other instances are not addressed by this clause is required.

If all flavors of OAM are relevant then the other ones should be listed too.

**SuggestedRemedy**

Per comment

**Response**  **Response Status:** C

REJECT.

Terminology of Clause 8 Ethenet link matches IEEE 802.3-2022 Clause 57

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CI</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ran, Adee</td>
<td>Cisco</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment Type:** E  **Comment Status:** R

The structure of clause 8 is very different than that of clauses 5 and 6. The introduction and overview subclauses include a detailed description of the technology which seems unnecessary in this document, and may have discrepancy with the normative definitions in 802.3. Few people will check for such discrepancies; it would be better to point to 802.3 instead.

The structure of clause 5 seems more appropriate.

**SuggestedRemedy**

Align the structure of this clause to clause 5 and remove the details of the technology.

**Response**  **Response Status:** C

REJECT.

Insufficient justification for change