#1   Type: E   TF: TF2   Clause: FM   Page: 0   Line: 0 Commenter: Marek Hajduczenia / Charter

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

MEC Review: Time to update the copyright year. Update all references from "Copyright (C) 2020" to "Copyright (C) 2021"

Per comment

-

#2   Type: E   TF: TF2   Clause: FM   Page: 3   Line: 1 Commenter: Marek Hajduczenia / Charter

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

MEC Review: Front matter needs to be updated

The frontmatter sections on pages 3 through5 shall be updated. The current disclaimers can be copied from the draft templates, which which can be downloaded from https://standards.ieee.org/develop/drafting-standard/resources.html

-

#5   Type: E   TF: TF2   Clause: 2   Page: 15   Line: 6 Commenter: Marek Hajduczenia / Charter

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

MEC Review: use of normative reference. The following normative references are not cited in the document: - IEEE Std 802.1QTM-2018 - ITU-T Recommendation G.984.3 - ITU-T Recommendation G.987.3

Remove these references, since they are not used at all

-

#14   Type: E   TF: TF2   Clause: 3.5.3   Page: 21   Line: 15 Commenter: Bill Powell / Independent

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

In several places (e.g. - Lines 4, 8, 16, & 22 on same page) the term "Additional Information" is used with both words capitalized. However, the title of clause 3.5.3 does not capitalize "information."

For consistency, it would would seem that the title of clause 3.5.3 should be changed to "Additional Information."

-

#15   Type: E   TF: TF2   Clause: 3.5.4   Page: 21   Line: 24 Commenter: Bill Powell / Independent

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

In several places (e.g. - Lines 4, 8, & 28 on same page) the term "Exception Information" is used with both words capitalized. However, the title of clause 3.5.4 does not capitalize "information."

For consistency, it would would seem that the title of clause 3.5.4 should be changed to "Exception Information."

-

#4   Type: E   TF: TF2   Clause: 4.3.1.4.1.4   Page: 28   Line: 32 Commenter: Marek Hajduczenia / Charter

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

MEC Review: word usage, word "WILL"

Replace "The receipt of this primitive will cause" to "The receipt of this primitive causes" (2 instances in the draft) Replace "the specific element name will be used" to "the specific element name is used" (2 instances on page 100)

-

#3   Type: E   TF: TF2   Clause: 7.2.2   Page: 53   Line: 32 Commenter: Marek Hajduczenia / Charter

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

MEC Review: word usage, word "MUST"

Replace "that DTE must be VLC-aware" to "that DTE is expected to be VLC-aware

-

#9   Type: E   TF: TF2   Clause: 8.1.4   Page: 62   Line: 10 Commenter: Glen Kramer / Broadcom

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

Stray "1" in "the requested 1 action"

Delete "1"

-

#10   Type: E   TF: TF2   Clause: 8.1.4.2   Page: 63   Line: 19 Commenter: Glen Kramer / Broadcom

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

Typo in "is shall not configure".

Replace "is" with "it"

-

#12	Type: TR	TF: TF2	Clause: 8.1.4.3	Page: 64	Line: 8	Commenter: Glen Kramer / Broadcom
Comment Status: New		Response Status: None		Commenter Satisfaction: None		Category: -

Threre is an ambiguity in the format of 'Remove a rule' VLCPDU that would prevent succesful parsing of this message. "A bulk 'Remove a rule' VLCPDU includes multiple RuleId fields. In case the number of rules being removed exceeds the capacity of a single VLCPDU, a bulk 'Remove a rule' request may consist of multiple VLC_CONFIG VLCPDUs, identified by incrementing MsgSequence values." "A 'Remove a rule' request with the RuleId value equal to 0x00 is treated as a 'Remove all rules' request." There is no mentioning whether Terminating RuleTLV should still follow the sequence of RuleId values. If the terminating TLV (0x00-04-00-00) is expected, then it is not clear how to differentiate RuleId 0x00-04 from the first two octets of that TLV. If the terminating TLV is not used in 'Remove a rule' request, then what values are used to pad the remaining size of VLCPDU? Any value, including 0x00-00 can be mistaken for a ruleId.

The difficulty arose because of trying to keep a universal message format for different types of messages. In some messages RuleId is a single field fixed in position as part of the frame format. In other messages, there can be a variable number of RuleId fields that require some kind of terminator sequense. The problem does not exist if we don't allow multiple RuleId values per VLCPDU. That means that to do a bulk rule removal, we need to use multiple VLCPDUs, one per rule, just like bulk rule addition. (We still remove ALL RULES using a single message though.) If this is the direction TF agrees to take, then the following change is needed: Replace "A bulk 'Remove a rule' VLCPDU includes multiple RuleId fields. In case the number of rules being removed exceeds the capacity of a single VLCPDU, a bulk 'Remove a rule' request may consist of multiple VLC_CONFIG VLCPDUs, identified by incrementing MsgSequence values." with "A bulk 'Remove a rule' request message consists of multiple VLC_CONFIG VLCPDUs, as indicated by incrementing MsgSequence values." But if the group desires to keep the bulk removal using a single VLCPDU, then it seems we need to specify different VLCPDU format for such message. Discussion is needed.

-

#11	Type: E	TF: TF2	Clause: 8.1.4.3	Page: 64	Line: 21	Commenter: Glen Kramer / Broadcom
Comment Status: New		Response Status: None		Commenter Satisfaction: None		Category: -

Typo in "is shall not remove"

Replace "is" with "it"

-

#13	Type: TR	TF: TF2	Clause: 8A.1.3	Page: 90	Line: 1	Commenter: Glen Kramer / Broadcom
Comment Status: New		Response Status: None		Commenter Satisfaction: None		Category: -

All examples in Annex 8A mention that to delete rules, the message looks identical for provisioning the rule, except the MsgCode is changed fro 0x1 to 0x2 (see Table 8-1). That was the case before RuleID values were introduce, but is not true anymore. The message to remove a rule only contains the RuleID, and not the content of the rules. Also, removing the rules can be accomplished in several ways (i.e., remove all, remove one-by-one, or remove in bulk). Not clear which way is prefereable to describe in the example, or even if we need to mention rule deletion at all. It does not provide any information useful for understanding how different use cases operate.

Remove the following subsclauses (with all subordinate subclauses, if any): 8A.1.3 8A.2.3 8A.3.3 8A.4.3

-

#7	Type: TR	TF: TF2	Clause: 8A.4.1	Page: 100	Line: 6	Commenter: Glen Kramer / Broadcom
Comment Status: New		Response Status: None		Commenter Satisfaction: None		Category: -

It is unclear if the two footnotes on this page are correct. The OLT and ONUs mentioned in this subclause are not EPON OLT and ONU. The OLT represented in this subclause does not does not correspond to the L-OLT, C-OLT, or S-OLT defined in 1904.1. Same for the ONU. Also, there is no such term as T-OLT and T-ONU defined in 1904.1. It should be L-OLT and L-ONU (for Line-)

Consider removing the footnotes. If there is a strong argument for keeping the footnotes, then explain the relations of ITU-T OLT and ONU to those defined in 1904.1 in more detail. Also replace "T-OLT, S-OLT, and C-OLT" with "L-OLT, C-OLT, and S-OLT" (note the order). Apply the same change to the ONU.

-

#6	Type: TR	TF: TF2	Clause: 8A.4.1	Page: 100	Line: 12	Commenter: Glen Kramer / Broadcom
Comment Status: New		Response Status: None		Commenter Satisfaction: None		Category: -

Reference to a wrong figure. Figure 8A-1 does not show an OLT with a MAC address T.

reference Figure 8A-4.

-

#8	Type: TR	TF: TF2	Clause: 8A.4.2	Page: 101	Line: 1	Commenter: Glen Kramer / Broadcom
Comment Status: New		Response Status: None		Commenter Satisfaction: None		Category: -

The term "PON controller" is not used anywhere else in the document. Instead we adopted the term"Manager". Also note the misspelling.

Replace as indicated.

-

#16	Type: TR	TF: TF2	Clause: 8A.5	Page: 104	Line: 4	Commenter: Glen Kramer / Broadcom
Comment Status: New		Response Status: None		Commenter Satisfaction: None		Category: -

A remaining action item is to show a use case exampole for Remote IEEE EPON Management over VLC

The proposed text is shown in tf2_2101-kramer_1.pdf. Insert as a new subclause 8A.5 at the end of the document.

-