

#5 Type: ER TF: TF2 Clause: 3.1 Page: 13 Line: 9 Commenter: Curtis Knittle / CableLabs
Comment Status: New Response Status: None Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: -

NMS definition should not be specific to OLTs

Remove this text: "used to drive the operation of the Optical Line Terminal (OLT) and its functions, "

-

#6 Type: TR TF: TF2 Clause: 3.2 Page: 13 Line: 17 Commenter: Curtis Knittle / CableLabs
Comment Status: New Response Status: None Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: -

Missing definition

Insert "ONU Management Control Interface" for definition of OMCI

-

#7 Type: TR TF: TF2 Clause: 3.4.8 Page: 16 Line: 18 Commenter: Curtis Knittle / CableLabs
Comment Status: New Response Status: None Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: -

Missing a zero in the binary number

Change 0b0001000 to 0b00001000

-

#8 Type: ER TF: TF2 Clause: 4.1 Page: 20 Line: 5 Commenter: Curtis Knittle / CableLabs
Comment Status: New Response Status: None Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: -

Use of 'a' or 'an' is dependent on how the acronym is pronounced. UMTTPDU begins with a consonant sound, and therefore it should be "a UMTTPDU"

Change "an UMTTPDU" "a UMTTPDU" (this occurs in other places in the document)

-

#15 Type: ER TF: TF2 Clause: 4.1 Page: 20 Line: 5 Commenter: Curtis Knittle / CableLabs
Comment Status: New Response Status: None Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: -

This is actually the first time UMTTPDU is used in the text, so it should be spelled out and acronymized correctly.

Replace "UMTPDU" with "Universal Management Tunnel Protocol Data Unit (UMTPDU)"

-

#11 Type: ER TF: TF2 Clause: 4.1 Page: 20 Line: 8 Commenter: Curtis Knittle / CableLabs
Comment Status: New Response Status: None Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: -

UMT Sublayer and UMT sublayer are used interchangeably

Pick one and use throughout document. Looks like other types of sublayers use lowercase, so perhaps we should use lowercase everywhere.

-

#9 Type: ER TF: TF2 Clause: 4.1 Page: 20 Line: 9 Commenter: Curtis Knittle / CableLabs
Comment Status: New Response Status: None Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: -

"some ports and not the other" sounds funny

Change to "some ports and not others"

-

#10 Type: ER TF: TF2 Clause: 4.1 Page: 20 Line: 12 Commenter: Curtis Knittle / CableLabs
Comment Status: New Response Status: None Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: -

Unnecessary comman at the end

Remove the comma after mechanisms

-

#12 Type: E TF: TF2 Clause: 4.1 Page: 20 Line: 25 Commenter: Curtis Knittle / CableLabs
Comment Status: New Response Status: None Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: -

Because there are many tunnels, I'm wondering if it makes more sense to use "UMT entrance point" instead of "tunnel entrance point" for the UMT standard? Same for "tunnel exit point"

Use UMT entrance point in place of tunnel entrance point Use UMT exit point in place of tunnel exit point

-

#13 Type: ER TF: TF2 Clause: 4.2 Page: 21 Line: 1 Commenter: Curtis Knittle / CableLabs
Comment Status: New Response Status: None Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: -

Diagram uses UMT client (lowercase) while the text uses UMT Client (uppercase)

Use UMT Client in the diagram (although, why capitalize Client if we don't capitalize sublayer?)

-

#14 Type: ER TF: TF2 Clause: 4.3 Page: 22 Line: 1 Commenter: Curtis Knittle / CableLabs
Comment Status: New Response Status: None Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: -

Diagram uses UMT client (lowercase) while the text uses UMT Client (uppercase). Also, If we're going to use UMT Client, then it should be OMCI Client and MAC Control Client

Use uppercase Client when reference UMT client and OMCI client and MAC Control client. Or pick on and be consistent.

-

#16 Type: ER TF: TF2 Clause: 5.1 Page: 23 Line: 4 Commenter: Curtis Knittle / CableLabs

Comment Status: New Response Status: None Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: -

I think it is an Ethernet MAC frame is shown in IEEE Std 802.3 Clause 3, not a UMTPDU, since the UMTPDU is being defined in this standard. In fact, Fig 5-1 in this standard shows the UMTPDU format.

Change "UMTPDU" to "Ethernet MAC frame"

-

#20 Type: TR TF: TF2 Clause: 5.1 Page: 23 Line: 6 Commenter: Curtis Knittle / CableLabs

Comment Status: New Response Status: None Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: -

In line 4 we refer to the EtherType, whereas in line 6 the figure uses LengthType

Use EtherType instead of LengthType (many places in the document)

-

#17 Type: TR TF: TF2 Clause: 5.1 Page: 23 Line: 10 Commenter: Curtis Knittle / CableLabs

Comment Status: New Response Status: None Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: -

I understand the destination address can be broadcast or multicast, not just unicast

Remove "individual (unicast)"

-

#18 Type: TR TF: TF2 Clause: 5.1 Page: 23 Line: 26 Commenter: Curtis Knittle / CableLabs

Comment Status: New Response Status: None Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: -

It isn't correct to use the UMT payload size to determine whether Pad is present or not. Case in point - what if there's a VLAN tag added to the UMTPDU? The last two sentences of this definition are accurate.

Remove "This field is present only when the total length of the UMT payload is below 45 octets. "

-

#21 Type: TR TF: TF2 Clause: 5.2 Page: 24 Line: 8 Commenter: Curtis Knittle / CableLabs

Comment Status: New Response Status: None Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: -

Why do we need two org subtypes? How does an implementation decide which one to use? Can we pick just one?

use only a single Subtype field or org-specific payloads. Reflect this change in other parts of the document.

-

#19 Type: TR TF: TF2 Clause: 5.2.4 Page: 26 Line: 1 Commenter: Curtis Knittle / CableLabs

Comment Status: New Response Status: None Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: -

The 3rd field in an Ethernet frame is the EtherType, yes? The figure should use EtherType instead of L2LengthType

In the figure, change L2LengthType to EtherType

-

#2 Type: TR TF: TF2 Clause: 5.3 Page: 28 Line: 10 Commenter: Glen Kramer / Broadcom

Comment Status: New Response Status: None Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: -

An action item from March meeting required to add material describing VLAN operations on UMTPDUs. For more information, see Requirement 2 in tf2_2004_kramer_1.pdf. To resolve this comment, the following steps are proposed: 1) The initial introduction of UMTPDU format should only show a generic untagged frame to make it consistent with the subtype definitions that follow in sections 5.2.1 through 5.2.6. 2) Place the introduction of VLAN tagged UMTPDU formats together with the corresponding figures in one place in section 5.3 3) Add a new section describing the available operations on VLAN tags and clarifying the relationship between these operations and 802.1Q specification.

1) Replace figure 5-1 with a figure shown in tf2_2004_kramer_3.pdf (UMTPDU without VLAN tags) 2) Replace the editorial note in Section 5.3 with the text and Figure (UMTPDUs with VLAN tags) as shown in tf2_2004_kramer_3.pdf 3) Add a new section 6.4 as shown in tf2_2004_kramer_3.pdf

-

#22 Type: E TF: TF2 Clause: 6.1.1.1 Page: 30 Line: 1 Commenter: Curtis Knittle / CableLabs

Comment Status: New Response Status: None Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: -

4 lines earlier these were called "classification conditions", but the subheading title leaves out classification. Best to be consistent 4 lines later.

Change title to CTE rule classification conditions

-

#23 Type: ER TF: TF2 Clause: 6.1.1.1 Page: 30 Line: 13 Commenter: Curtis Knittle / CableLabs

Comment Status: New Response Status: None Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: -

typo

Change equivalent to equivalent

-

#3 Type: TR TF: TF2 Clause: 6.1.1.1.2 Page: 30 Line: 18 Commenter: Glen Kramer / Broadcom

Comment Status: New Response Status: None Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: -

L2 network may rely on virtual topology such that UMTPDUs may be required to include one or two VLAN tags. In some use cases, if an xPDU already includes VLAN tag(s), the UMT sublayer must be able to preserve these tags in an UMTPDU. For more information, see Requirement 2 in tf2_2004_kramer_1.pdf

1) Add field codes specific to UMTPDUs and xPDUs to Table 6-1 as shown in tf2_2004_kramer_2.pdf. 2) Include operation COPY into Table 6-2 as shown in tf2_2004_kramer_2.pdf.

-

#24 Type: E TF: TF2 Clause: 6.1.1.2 Page: 31 Line: 1 Commenter: Curtis Knittle / CableLabs

Comment Status: New Response Status: None Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: -

Consistency with earlier term

Change title to CTE rule modification actions

-

#4Type: TRTF: TF2Clause: 7.1Page: 39Line: 6Commenter: Pradeep K Kondamuri / Ciena

Comment Status: NewResponse Status: NoneCommenter Satisfaction: NoneCategory: -

Editorial note
Note that even when a UMT configuration request or a response consists of multiple messages, a single rule TLV is not split across multiple messages and as such no reassembly mechanism is necessary to reconstruct any rule TLV. An example scenario where the response consists of multiple messages with decrementing MsgSequence values would be a UMT configuration response to a ‘Query all rules’ request, where all the rules do not fit in a single response message.
-

#1Type: TTF: TF2Clause: 7.2Page: 40Line: 1Commenter: Glen Kramer / Broadcom

Comment Status: NewResponse Status: NoneCommenter Satisfaction: NoneCategory: -

In table 7-3, the Value for the Length field can be different than L+4. When the TLV type is 0x00, the TLV length would only be 2. Also, there can be TLVs with only Operation filed, but no Field Code. Such TLVs will have length of 3. An alternative is to require placeholders for the Operation and FieldCode to be present in every TLV, even if they are not used. Draft is currently consistent with this approach.
If it is desired to trim unused TLV fields, insert "0x02, 0x03, or " before "L+4" If we keep TLV length to 4 bytes minumum, then we need to clarify what placeholder values are to be used for Operation, FieldCode, and Value TLV fields when these fields are no used.
-