#6	Type: ER	TF: TF2	Clause: 3.1	Page: 13	Line: 10	Commenter: Kevin A. Noll / Tibit Communications
Comment Status: New		Response Status: None		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: New		Response Status: None		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: New		Response Status: None		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: New		Response Status: None		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: New		Response Status: None		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: New		Response Status: None		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: New		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

-

#5	Type: TR	TF: TF2	Clause: 5.2	Page: 24	Line: 7	Commenter: Glen Kramer / Broadcom
Comment Status: New		Response Status: None		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: New		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.

-

#14	Type: TR	TF: TF2	Clause: 6	Page: 26	Line: 10	Commenter: Kevin A. Noll / Tibit Communications
Comment Status: New		Response Status: None		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

-

#13	Type: TR	TF: TF2	Clause: 6	Page: 26	Line: 10	Commenter: Kevin A. Noll / Tibit Communications
Comment Status: New		Response Status: None		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

-

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

| Comment Status: New | Response Status: None | 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 happenes 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.

-

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

| Comment Status: New | Response Status: None | 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

-

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

| Comment Status: New | Response Status: None | 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).

-

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

| Comment Status: New | 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 exampe 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

-

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

| Comment Status: New | Response Status: None | 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.

-

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

| Comment Status: New | Response Status: None | 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: New | Response Status: None | 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 througout the uses in the text.

-

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

| Comment Status: New | Response Status: None | 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: New | Response Status: None | 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: New | Response Status: None | 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

-