| IEEE 1904.2 UMT, D0.4, Approved Responses | Printed on 26 March 2020 at 6:37:31 AM |
|---|---|
| #13 Type: ER TF: TF2 Clause: 0 Comment Status: Resolved Response Status: Accept Page numbering needs to be fixed - page in PDF does no Per comment - | Page: 0 Line: 0 Commenter: Marek Hajduczenia / Charter Commenter Satisfaction: Satisfied Category: - ot match page numberign displayed |
| #10 Type: E TF: TF2 Clause: 3.5 Comment Status: Resolved Response Status: Accept Text in yellow will need to be replaced with specific PICS Add editorial comment in front of the text marked in ye replaced with a valid example of PICS, once PICS becom - | llow to read as follows: "Editorial Note (to be removed prior to publication): The following text in yellow needs to be |
| #1 Type: TR TF: TF2 Clause: 4.1 Comment Status: Resolved Response Status: Accept the UMT client is also optional, isn't it? "Both UMT client and UMT sublayer are optional" - | Page: 21 Line: 8 Commenter: Pradeep Kondamuri / Ciena Commenter Satisfaction: Satisfied Category: - |
| #2 Type: ER TF: TF2 Clause: 4.1 Comment Status: Resolved Response Status: Accept typo change UPTPDUs to UMTPDUs - | Page: 21 Line: 20 Commenter: Pradeep Kondamuri / Ciena Commenter Satisfaction: Satisfied Category: UPTPDU |
| #11 Type: E TF: TF2 Clause: 4.1 Comment Status: Resolved Response Status: Accept UPTPDU should be UMTPDU Change globally See also comment #2 | Page: 21 Line: 20 Commenter: Marek Hajduczenia / Charter Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: UPTPDU |
| #3 Type: TR TF: TF2 Clause: 5.1 Comment Status: Resolved Response Status: Accept A note about source device should be added, similar to On line 15 add, "Note that the source device may not be - | Page: 24 Line: 13 Commenter: Pradeep Kondamuri / Ciena Commenter Satisfaction: Satisfied Category: - the one added for destination device in line 11 e UMT aware and the UMT tunnel may be originated after the frame leaves that device." |
| #12 Type: TR TF: TF2 Clause: 5.2 Comment Status: Resolved Response Status: Accept Incorrect range "0x05 to 0xFD" Change to "0x07 to 0xFD" to match the value in previou See also comment #4 | Page: 25 Line: 7 Commenter: Marek Hajduczenia / Charter Commenter Satisfaction: Satisfied Category: 0x07 s row |
| #4 Type: ER TF: TF2 Clause: 5.2 Comment Status: Resolved Response Status: Accept typo in the Value column of penultimate row of the tabl change "0x05 to 0xFD" to "0x07 to 0xFD" - | Page: 25 Line: 7 Commenter: Pradeep Kondamuri / Ciena Commenter Satisfaction: Satisfied Category: 0x07 le |
| strawman proposal and see whether it generates any po Per comment | Page: 29 Line: 9 Commenter: Marek Hajduczenia / Charter Commenter Satisfaction: Satisfied Category: - naveinb been presented by Glen before. Is there any chance we can roll it into the next version of the dratf as a positive feedback? |

| IEEE 1904.2 UMT, D0.4, Approved Responses | Printed on 26 March 2020 at 6:37:31 AN |
|--|---|
| #15 Type: TR TF: TF2 Clause: 6.2.1.2 | Page: 34 Line: 19 Commenter: Marek Hajduczenia / Charter |
| Comment Status: Resolved Response Status: AIP | Commenter Satisfaction: Satisfied Category: - |
| Content missing | |
| Use tf2_d0_4_hajduczenia_1.docx | |
| Use tf2_d0_4_hajduczenia_1a.docx | |
| #16 Type: TR TF: TF2 Clause: 6.2.1.3 | Page: 35 Line: 2 Commenter: Marek Hajduczenia / Charter |
| Comment Status: Resolved Response Status: Reject | Commenter Satisfaction: Satisfied Category: - |
| Content missing | |
| - | ne from UMTPDU - the original frame would include DA/SA information, which is not propagated correctly across the ngress point for UMPTDU, and its MAC address is lost traversing the UMT link. Changes to L3 type UMTPDU will be be |
| No changes to the draft for now. | |
| ^{‡7} Type: ER TF: TF2 Clause: 6.2.2 | Page: 35 Line: 4 Commenter: Pradeep Kondamuri / Ciena |
| Comment Status: Resolved Response Status: AIP | Commenter Satisfaction: Satisfied Category: - |
| The description of ingress tunnel entrance rules is inco | prrect; the current description is just a copy/paste of ingress tunnel exit rules in 6.2.1 |
| | |
| Delete incorrect text in 6.2.2 and insert editorial note | with Glen's name to provide the text for the next draft. |
| #8 Type: T TF: TF2 Clause: 7.1 | Page: 39 Line: 1 Commenter: Pradeep Kondamuri / Ciena |
| Comment Status: Resolved Response Status: AIP | Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: - |
| Does the message sequence number imply any kind of | f message reassembly? Perhaps an example can help. |
| | |
| nsert an editorial: Pradeep to propose text for the ne | xt draft cycle covering the lack of need for reassembly mechanism. |
| #9 Type: ER TF: TF2 Clause: 7.2 | Page: 40 Line: 1 Commenter: Pradeep Kondamuri / Ciena |
| Comment Status: Resolved Response Status: AIP | Commenter Satisfaction: Satisfied Category: - |
| think the value 'N' in table 7-3 is not the same as valu | ue 'N' used elsewhere in the document. If it is not, use a different alphabet to represent it |
| | |
| Change N to L in two locations in table 7-3 (make it ita | lics) |

Page 2 of 2