

#6 Type: ER TF: TF2 Clause: 3.1 Page: 13 Line: 10 Commenter: Kevin A. Noll / Tibit Communications

Comment Status: Proposed Response Status: Accept Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: -

"Faults, Accounting, Configuration, Performance, and Security (FCAPS)" should be "Fault, Configuration, Accounting, Performance, Security management (FCAPS)"

Change text to "Fault, Configuration, Accounting, Performance, Security management (FCAPS)"

#7 Type: ER TF: TF2 Clause: 3.2 Page: 13 Line: 21 Commenter: Kevin A. Noll / Tibit Communications

Comment Status: Proposed Response Status: Accept Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: -

Faults, Accounting, Configuration, Performance, and Security should be "Fault, Configuration, Accounting, Performance, Security management"

Change text to "Fault, Configuration, Accounting, Performance, Security management (FCAPS)"

#4 Type: TR TF: TF2 Clause: 6.1 Page: 15 Line: 14 Commenter: Glen Kramer / Broadcom

Comment Status: Proposed Response Status: Accept Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: -

The layering diagram in Figure 4-1 and the interlayer interface definitions in Figure 4-2 were all updated to show UMT client and OMCI client sitting on top of UMT sublayer. But the block diagram in Figure 6-1 has not been updated.

Modify the UMT sublayer block diagram as shown in tf2\_2005\_kramer\_2.pdf.

#15 Type: ER TF: TF2 Clause: 5.1 Page: 23 Line: 11 Commenter: Kevin A. Noll / Tibit Communications

Comment Status: Proposed Response Status: Accept Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: -

The sentence "Note that the destination device may not be UMT-aware and the UMT tunnel may be terminated before the frame reaches that device" is confusing.

Reword "The station identified by DestinationAddress might not be UMT-aware which would require that the UMT tunnel be terminated before the UMTPDU reaches the station identified by the DestinationAddress"

#16 Type: ER TF: TF2 Clause: 5.1 Page: 23 Line: 15 Commenter: Kevin A. Noll / Tibit Communications

Comment Status: Proposed Response Status: Accept Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: -

The sentence "Note that the source device may not be UMT aware and the UMT tunnel may be originated after the frame leaves that device" is confusing.

Reword "The station identified by SourceAddress might not be UMT-aware which would require that the UMT tunnel be terminated before the UMTPDU reaches the station identified by the DestinationAddress"

#17 Type: ER TF: TF2 Clause: 5.1 Page: 23 Line: 27 Commenter: Kevin A. Noll / Tibit Communications

Comment Status: Proposed Response Status: Accept Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: -

Reference to 802.3 is in green text.

Change text color to black

#8 Type: TR TF: TF2 Clause: 5.2 Page: 24 Line: 6 Commenter: Kevin A. Noll / Tibit Communications

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

Table 5-1 shows OMCI\_Subtype as 0x04. Current implementations of the draft are using 0x0C.

Designate OMCI\_Subtype as 0x0C

\*\*\*\*\* Comment withdrawn on 2020.05.18, at 13:34

#5 Type: TR TF: TF2 Clause: 5.2 Page: 24 Line: 7 Commenter: Glen Kramer / Broadcom

Comment Status: Proposed Response Status: Accept Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: -

Action item taken at the last meeting to align two organization-specific UMTPDU subtypes with two OUI types (24-bit and 36-bit).

1) Remove the editorial note on page 24. 2) Modify table 5-1 as shown in tf2\_2005\_kramer\_3.pdf 3) Modify subclause 5.2.6 as shown in tf2\_2005\_kramer\_3.pdf File tf2\_2005\_kramer\_4.pdf is a clean version of the proposed changes.

#21 Type: ER TF: TF2 Clause: 5.2.1 Page: 24 Line: 11 Commenter: Kevin A. Noll / Tibit Communications

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

Subclause 5.2.1 refers to UMTPDUs with subtype 0x00 as UMT\_CONFIG, but no other UMTPDU subtype is given a "special" name.

Assign "special" name to each UMTPDU subtype and use as needed in the text.

\*\*\*\*\* Comment withdrawn on 2020.05.18, at 13:35

#14 Type: TR TF: TF2 Clause: 6 Page: 26 Line: 10 Commenter: Kevin A. Noll / Tibit Communications

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

There is no specification for how to forward a frame to the proper entity after rules are processed. All of the text and diagrams (see Fig 6-1) seem to assume that the resulting frame will go to UMTSI:MA\_DATA.indication or MACCSI:MA\_DATA.request. This would not be true for UMT Client PDUs and for OMCI frames destined to the OMCI client.

Add text and attributes to allow a rule to specify the primitives. See tf2\_2005\_d\_06\_rule\_processing\_noll\_1

Per proposal but with following changes: - 0x020 should be 0x02 - Table\_Spec should be TableSpec Also, it seems Length field should be L+6 now that 2 extra octets were added.

#13 Type: TR TF: TF2 Clause: 6 Page: 26 Line: 10 Commenter: Kevin A. Noll / Tibit Communications

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

The text in clause 6 says that there are two CTE instances - one transmit and one receive. There is no way for the UMT configuration protocol to specify which path a rule should be applied.

Add a field in the UMT config PDU that specifies the direction to apply the rule. Alternatively, change the text to indicate that there is only one CTE instance. See tf2\_2005\_d\_06\_rule\_processing\_noll\_1

Per proposal but with following changes: - 0x020 should be 0x02 - Table\_Spec should be TableSpec Also, it seems Length field should be L+6 now that 2 extra octets were added.

#11 Type: TR TF: TF2 Clause: 6 Page: 29 Line: - Commenter: Kevin A. Noll / Tibit Communications

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

Is it possible to have more than one rule in place at a time? If so, then it is possible that a frame could match more than one rule. How does the UMT CTE resolve conflicts? For example, what happens if an incoming frame matches more than one rule?

Add a priority field to the CTE rule structure and specify how rules are to be processed. See tf2\_2005\_d\_06\_rule\_processing\_noll\_1. Alternatively, add language that requires the NMS to configure the CTE such that there is never a possibility that more than one rule could match.

Per proposal but with following changes: - 0x020 should be 0x02 - Table\_Spec should be TableSpec Also, it seems Length field should be L+6 now that 2 extra octets were added.

#20 Type: TR TF: TF2 Clause: 6.1 Page: 29 Line: 15 Commenter: Kevin A. Noll / Tibit Communications

Comment Status: Proposed Response Status: Reject Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: -

Figure 6-1 shows the interface from OAM Sublayer to UMT Sublayer using MA\_DATA primitives. It does not show the primitives to the OMCI client as depicted in figure 4-2. Since Fig 4-2 depicts a different set of primitives, for the OMCI client, fig 6-1 should also show these primitives.

Submitted diagram

Contribution not available at this time for review.

#9 Type: ER TF: TF2 Clause: 6.1.1 Page: 29 Line: 20 Commenter: Kevin A. Noll / Tibit Communications

Comment Status: Proposed Response Status: Reject Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: -

The rule syntax described here is not used anywhere else in the document. Is it necessary?

Adopt the format used in 1904.1 clause 7 (e.g. Table 7-6, etc).

Please suggest specific changes.

#12 Type: TR TF: TF2 Clause: 6.1.1.2 Page: 30 Line: - Commenter: Kevin A. Noll / Tibit Communications

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

Currently the text implies that classification fields allow only exact matches. What if an implementer wishes to match a range of, for example all Multicast, or all of a given OUI?

Add field codes that allow ranges or masks. See tf2\_2005\_d0\_6\_mask\_matching\_noll\_1

\*\*\*\*\* Comment withdrawn on 2020.05.18, at 13:33

#10 Type: ER TF: TF2 Clause: 6.1.1.2 Page: 30 Line: 18 Commenter: Kevin A. Noll / Tibit Communications

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

Table 6-2 is labeled as "L2 classification fields". This is confusing as the table contains classification fields for an L2 subtype payload as well as for the UMT header fields.

Rename the table to "Classification fields" or split the table to "UMT classification fields" and "L2 subtype classification fields". I favor the latter.

Rename the table to "Classification fields"

#19 Type: ER TF: TF2 Clause: 6.1.1.1.2 Page: 30 Line: 18 Commenter: Kevin A. Noll / Tibit Communications

Comment Status: Proposed Response Status: Accept Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: -

Table 6-2 uses DST\_ADDR and SRC\_ADDR. This is not consistent with 1904.1

CHANGE "DST\_ADDR" and "SRC\_ADDR" to "DA" and "SA", respectively in Table 6-2 and throughout the uses in the text.

-

#18 Type: ER TF: TF2 Clause: 6.1.1.2 Page: 32 Line: 4 Commenter: Kevin A. Noll / Tibit Communications

Comment Status: Proposed Response Status: Accept Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: -

Table 6-3 specifies a "DELETE" and a "CHANGE" action. This is not consistent with how 1904.1 describes classification and actions.

Change "DELETE" to "REMOVE" and "CHANGE" to "REPLACE" in Table 6-3 and throughout the uses in the text.

-

#1 Type: TR TF: TF2 Clause: 7.1 Page: 40 Line: 14 Commenter: Glen Kramer / Broadcom

Comment Status: Proposed Response Status: Accept Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: -

In table 7-2, the the description for the Direction field incorrectly states that a rule for transmit path is an ingress rule and the rule for the receive path is an egress rules.

Swap the words "ingress" and "egress"

-

#3 Type: TR TF: TF2 Clause: 7.2 Page: 41 Line: 1 Commenter: Glen Kramer / Broadcom

Comment Status: Proposed Response Status: Accept Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: -

By allowing a field mask to be used in CTE rule conditions, we can eliminate the field codes for fields that are sub-fields of other defined fields, e.g., VLAN0\_TPID, VLAN1\_VID, etc.

1) Add a Mask component to CTE rule TLV structure as shown in tf2\_2005\_kramer\_5.pdf 2) Delete unnecessary field codes from table 6-2 and renumber the remaining codes as shown in tf2\_2005\_kramer\_6.pdf.

-

#2 Type: T TF: TF2 Clause: 7A.1 Page: 44 Line: 4 Commenter: Glen Kramer / Broadcom

Comment Status: Proposed Response Status: Accept Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: -

Annex 7A is empty

1) Add an example of OAM over UMT as shown in tf2\_2005\_kramer\_1.pdf 2) Add field code for XPDU\_SUBTYPE with value 0x26 as shown in tf2\_2005\_kramer\_6.pdf

-