IEEE 1904.2 UMT, D0.4, Received Comments (all comments)	Printed on 3/24/2020 at 4:52:12 PM
#13  Type: ER  TF: TF2  Clause: 0  Page: 0  Line: 0  Commenter: Marek Hajduczenia / Charter    Comment Status: New  Response Status: None  Commenter Satisfaction: None  Category: -    Page numbering needs to be fixed - page in PDF does not match page numberign displayed  Per comment  Very Category: -	
-    #10  Type: E  TF: TF2  Clause: 3.5  Page: 18  Line: 20  Commenter: Marek Hajduczenia / Charter    Comment Status: New  Response Status: None  Commenter Satisfaction: None  Category: -    Text in yellow will need to be replaced with specific PICS example, once PICS are available.  Add editorial comment in front of the text marked in yellow to read as follows: "Editorial Note (to be removed prior to publication): The replaced with a valid example of PICS, once PICS become available."	he following text in yellow needs to be
-  #1  Type: TR  TF: TF2  Clause: 4.1  Page: 21  Line: 8  Commenter: Pradeep Kondamuri / Ciena    Comment Status: New  Response Status: None  Commenter Satisfaction: None  Category: -    the UMT client is also optional, isn't it?  "Both UMT client and UMT sublayer are optional"  -	
#11  Type: E  TF: TF2  Clause: 4.1  Page: 21  Line: 20  Commenter: Marek Hajduczenia / Charter    Comment Status: New  Response Status: None  Commenter Satisfaction: None  Category: -    UPTPDU should be UMTPDU  Change globally  -	
#2  Type: ER  TF: TF2  Clause: 4.1  Page: 21  Line: 20  Commenter: Pradeep Kondamuri / Ciena    Comment Status: New  Response Status: None  Commenter Satisfaction: None  Category: -    typo  change UPTPDUs to UMTPDUs  -	
#3  Type: TR  TF: TF2  Clause: 5.1  Page: 24  Line: 13  Commenter: Pradeep Kondamuri / Ciena    Comment Status: New  Response Status: None  Commenter Satisfaction: None  Category: -    A note about source device should be added, similar to the one added for destination device in line 11  On line 15 add, "Note that the source device may not be UMT aware and the UMT tunnel may be originated after the frame leaves that a superior of the status of the source device may not be UMT aware and the UMT tunnel may be originated after the frame leaves that a superior of the status of the source device may not be UMT aware and the UMT tunnel may be originated after the frame leaves that a superior of the status of the statu	at device."
#12  Type: TR  TF: TF2  Clause: 5.2  Page: 25  Line: 7  Commenter: Marek Hajduczenia / Charter    Comment Status: New  Response Status: None  Commenter Satisfaction: None  Category: -    Incorrect range "0x05 to 0xFD"  Change to "0x07 to 0xFD" to match the value in previous row    -	
#4  Type: ER  TF: TF2  Clause: 5.2  Page: 25  Line: 7  Commenter: Pradeep Kondamuri / Ciena    Comment Status: New  Response Status: None  Commenter Satisfaction: None  Category: -    typo in the Value column of penultimate row of the table  -  -    -  -  -  -	
#14  Type: TR  TF: TF2  Clause: 5.3  Page: 29  Line: 9  Commenter: Marek Hajduczenia / Charter    Comment Status: New  Response Status: None  Commenter Satisfaction: None  Category: -    I do seem to recall material on VLAN tagged UMTPDUs haveinb been presented by Glen before. Is there any chance we can roll it into strawman proposal and see whether it generates any positive feedback?    Per comment	the next version of the dratf as a

#5 Type: T	TF: TF2 Clause: 5.3	Page: 29 Line: 11 Commenter: Pradeep Kondamuri / Ciena		
Comment Status: New	Response Status: None	Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: -		
I think VLAN tags should be allowed, particularly useful in VLAN-based forwarding of UMTPDUs over multiple UMT-unaware Ethernet hops				
-				
-				
#6 Type: T	TF: TF2 Clause: 5.3	Page: 29 Line: 12 Commenter: Pradeep Kondamuri / Ciena		
#6 Type: T Comment Status: New	TF: TF2 Clause: 5.3 Response Status: None	Page: 29 Line: 12 Commenter: Pradeep Kondamuri / Ciena Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: -		
Comment Status: New		Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: -		
Comment Status: New	Response Status: None	Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: -		
Comment Status: New	Response Status: None	Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: -		

IEEE 1904.2 UMT, D0.4, Received Comments (all comments)	Printed on 3/24/2020 at 4:52:12 PM			
#15  Type: TR  TF: TF2  Clause: 6.2.1.2  Page: 34  Line: 19  Commenter: Marek Hajducze    Comment Status: New  Response Status: None  Commenter Satisfaction: None  Category: -    Content missing	nia / Charter			
#16  Type: TR  TF: TF2  Clause: 6.2.1.3  Page: 35  Line: 2  Commenter: Marek Hajducze    Comment Status: New  Response Status: None  Commenter Satisfaction: None  Category: -    Content missing	formation, which is not propagated correctly across the			
#7  Type: ER  TF: TF2  Clause: 6.2.2  Page: 35  Line: 4  Commenter: Pradeep Kondan    Comment Status: New  Response Status: None  Commenter Satisfaction: None  Category: -    The description of ingress tunnel entrance rules is incorrect; the current description is just a copy/paste of ingress t  -    -  -  -				
#8  Type: T  TF: TF2  Clause: 7.1  Page: 39  Line: 1  Commenter: Pradeep Kondamuri / Ciena    Comment Status: New  Response Status: None  Commenter Satisfaction: None  Category: -    Does the message sequence number imply any kind of message reassembly? Perhaps an example can help.  -    -  -  -    -  -  -				
#9  Type: ER  TF: TF2  Clause: 7.2  Page: 40  Line: 1  Commenter: Pradeep Kondan    Comment Status: New  Response Status: None  Commenter Satisfaction: None  Category: -    I think the value 'N' in table 7-3 is not the same as value 'N' used elsewhere in the document. If it is not, use a differ    -	·			

## Page 2 of 2