#5   Type: ER   TF: TF2   Clause: 3.1   Page: 13   Line: 9 Commenter: Curtis Knittle / CableLabs
Comment Status: Resolved   Response Status: Accept   Commenter Satisfaction: Satisfied   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: Resolved   Response Status: Accept   Commenter Satisfaction: Satisfied   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: Resolved   Response Status: Accept   Commenter Satisfaction: Satisfied   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: Resolved   Response Status: Accept   Commenter Satisfaction: Satisfied   Category: -

| Use of 'a' or 'an' is dependent on how the acronym is pronounced. UMTPDU begins with a consonant sound, and therefore it should be "a UMTPDU" |
Change "an UMTPDU" "a UMTPDU" (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: Resolved   Response Status: Accept   Commenter Satisfaction: Satisfied   Category: -

| This is actually the first time UMTPDU 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: Resolved   Response Status: AIP   Commenter Satisfaction: Satisfied   Category: Client & Sublayer

| UMT Sublayer and UMT sublayer are used interchangably |
| Pick one and use throughout document. Looks like other types of sublayers use lowercase, so perhaps we should use lowercase everywhere. |
| Change all instances of "Sublayer" to "sublayer" and "Client" to "client" |

#9   Type: ER   TF: TF2   Clause: 4.1   Page: 20   Line: 9 Commenter: Curtis Knittle / CableLabs
Comment Status: Resolved   Response Status: AIP   Commenter Satisfaction: Satisfied   Category: -

| "some ports and not the other" sounds funny |
| Change to "some ports and not others" |
| Change to "some ports" |

#10   Type: ER   TF: TF2   Clause: 4.1   Page: 20   Line: 12 Commenter: Curtis Knittle / CableLabs
Comment Status: Resolved   Response Status: Accept   Commenter Satisfaction: Satisfied   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: Resolved   Response Status: Accept   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: Resolved   Response Status: AIP   Commenter Satisfaction: Satisfied   Category: Client & Sublayer

| 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?) |
| See comment #11 |

#14   Type: ER   TF: TF2   Clause: 4.3   Page: 22   Line: 1 Commenter: Curtis Knittle / CableLabs
Comment Status: Resolved   Response Status: AIP   Commenter Satisfaction: Satisfied   Category: Client & Sublayer

| 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. |
| See comment #11 |

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

Comment Status: Resolved   Response Status: Accept   Commenter Satisfaction: Satisfied   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: Resolved   Response Status: AIP   Commenter Satisfaction: Satisfied   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)
Use "LengthType" when referring to field name in UMTPDU, i.e., page 23, line 4   Page 26, line 16, change "the Ethertype/TPID field" to "the *EthertypeTPID* field

---

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

Comment Status: Resolved   Response Status: Accept   Commenter Satisfaction: Satisfied   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: Resolved   Response Status: Accept   Commenter Satisfaction: Satisfied   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: Resolved   Response Status: AIP   Commenter Satisfaction: Satisfied   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.
Insert editorial note into look into new organization specific ID structure and specify 0xFE for old (3 octet long) and 0xFF for new (longer) ones. Glen to take point on proposed changes.

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

Comment Status: Resolved   Response Status: AIP   Commenter Satisfaction: Satisfied   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
For consistency, it is L2LengthType, since it is a copy of the LengthType field carried in L2 frame encapsulating L3 frame. And it is not always EtherType   Change "L2LenthType" to "L2LengthType"

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

Comment Status: Resolved   Response Status: Accept   Commenter Satisfaction: Satisfied   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: Resolved   Response Status: Accept   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: Resolved   Response Status: Accept   Commenter Satisfaction: Satisfied   Category: -

typo
Change eqivalent to equivalent
-

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

Comment Status: Resolved   Response Status: Accept   Commenter Satisfaction: Satisfied   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: Resolved	Response Status: Accept	Commenter Satisfaction: None	Category: -

Consistency with earlier term

Change title to CTE rule modification actions

-

#4	Type: TR	TF: TF2	Clause: 7.1	Page: 39	Line: 6	Commenter: Pradeep K Kondamuri / Ciena

Comment Status: Resolved	Response Status: AIP	Commenter Satisfaction: Satisfied	Category: -

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.

Use the following text to replace the existing editorial note: Note that even when a UMT configuration request or a response consists of multiple messages, a single rule is not split across multiple messages and as such no reassembly mechanism is necessary to reconstruct any rule. 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 multiple rules are being reported.

#1	Type: T	TF: TF2	Clause: 7.2	Page: 40	Line: 1	Commenter: Glen Kramer / Broadcom

Comment Status: Resolved	Response Status: AIP	Commenter Satisfaction: None	Category: -

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.

Add a note to a table with the following content: "Fields Operation and FieldCode are present in all TLVs, even if they are not used. When these fields are not used, they are set to the value of zero."