#I-1 Type: T TF: TF2 Clause: 8A.5   Page: Line: - Commenter: Noll, Kevin / Vecima

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

Should include an example that reduces MAC address use.
Add text in file tf2_annex_8A.5.3_noll.pdf to clause 8A.5
Per proposed annex, with the followng changes: - "given in 8A.5.2 can be used as they are written" to "given in 8A.5.2 are used as written" - add missing figure caption: Figure 8A-6: Internal architecture of a Manager using a single MAC address

#I-25 Type: GR TF: TF2 Clause: 1   Page: 15   Line: - Commenter: Perry, Lisa /

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

Per 12.2.2 of the IEEE Standards Style Manual, all documents shall include an Overview as Clause 1, which at a minimum would include Scope and Word usage. Insert the Word usage subclause.
1.x Word usage The word shall indicates mandatory requirements strictly to be followed in order to conform to the standard and from which no deviation is permitted (shall equals is required to).^1, ^2 The word should indicates that among several possibilities one is recommended as particularly suitable, without mentioning or excluding others; or that a certain course of action is preferred but not necessarily required (should equals is recommended that). The word may is used to indicate a course of action permissible within the limits of the standard (may equals is permitted to).   The word can is used for statements of possibility and capability, whether material, physical, or causal (can equals is able to). ^1 The use of the word must is deprecated and cannot be used when stating mandatory requirements; must is used only to describe unavoidable situations. ^2 The use of will is deprecated and cannot be used when stating` mandatory requirements; will is only used in statements of fact.
Inserted the missing subclause as 1.4 as proposed with changes to text of footnotes: - The word must is deprecated and cannot be used when stating mandatory requirements; must is used only to describe unavoidable situations. - The word will is deprecated and cannot be used when stating mandatory requirements; will is only used in statements of fact.

#I-12 Type: T TF: TF2 Clause: 3.5.2   Page: 22   Line: 22 Commenter: Rannow, R K / silverdraft supercomputing

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

completed as indicated with the information necessary to identify fully both the supplier and the implementation. The conjunctive term "both" is used in numerous instances with the conjunction "and" in the same sentence. Verbose and ambiguous Note: and = both
Review the instances of the term "both" and remove when used in the same sentence as the conjunctive term "and" to help ensure a succinct document.
Correlative conjunctions (like "both ..and" or either...or") are valid and useful grammatical constructs, Correlative conjunctions are stronger than coordinating conjunctions in emphasizing the relationship between the parts/ideas being joined. They are used extensively in IEEE standards (more than 500 occurrences in 802.3 standard) and they are even used in IEEE-provided front matter and in IEEE style manual. The BRC believes the existing instances of correlative conjunctions are well justified and no changes to the draft are necessary.

#I-17 Type: T TF: TF2 Clause: 4.1   Page: 25   Line: 4 Commenter: Laubach, Mark / IEEE member / Self Employed

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

I would recommend adding a reference to the IEEE http://standards-oui.ieee.org source for this assignment. Also, on reading http://standards-oui.ieee.org/ethertype/eth.txt, "UMT protocol" is still mentioned for the PROTOCOL description.
Consider adding the reference. Also see if the PROTOCOL description on-record text can be updated to a more current description.
Added a footnote to 0xA8-C8 with the following text: "The current list of Ethertype assignments is available at http://standards-oui.ieee.org/ethertype/eth.txt." The Chair was instructed to work with IEEE RA to update the description the description of the Ethertype value.

#I-6 Type: T TF: TF2 Clause: 5.2.2   Page: 34   Line: 4 Commenter: Rannow, R K / silverdraft supercomputing

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

IEEE Std 802.3, 57.4). The frame structure of a VLCPDU with OAM subtype shall be as depicted in Figure 5-2.   Appears ambiguous.
IEEE Std 802.3, 57.4). The frame structure of a VLCPDU with OAM subtype shall be structured as described by Figure 5-2.
"The frame structure shall be structured..." would be a poor stylistic choice. There is nothing ambiguous in the original sentences and the same language is used in multiple approved standards.

#I-7 Type: T TF: TF2 Clause: 5.2.3   Page: 34   Line: 18 Commenter: Rannow, R K / silverdraft supercomputing

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

The frame structure of a VLCPDU with OMCI subtype shall be as depicted in Figure 5-3.   Is ambiguous
The frame structure of a VLCPDU with OMCI subtype shall constructed as described by Figure 5-3.
The frame structure is a description or a characteristic of a frame. A frame can be constructed, but a frame structure can only be described or shown. There is nothing ambiguous in the original sentences and the same language is used in multiple approved standards.

#I-8 Type: T TF: TF2 Clause: 5.2.4   Page: 35   Line: 12 Commenter: Rannow, R K / silverdraft supercomputing

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

The frame structure of a VLCPDU with L2 subtype shall be as depicted in Figure 5-4.
The frame structure of a VLCPDU with L2 subtype 12 shall be constructed as described by Figure 5-4.
The frame structure is a description or a characteristic of a frame. A frame can be constructed, but a frame structure can only be described or shown. There is nothing ambiguous in the original sentences and the same language is used in multiple approved standards.

#I-9 Type: T TF: TF2 Clause: 5.2.5   Page: 36   Line: 16 Commenter: Rannow, R K / silverdraft supercomputing

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

The frame structure of a VLCPDU with EPD subtype shall be as depicted in Figure 5-5. Appears ambiguous
The frame structure of a VLCPDU with EPD subtype shall be constructed as described by Figure 5-5.
The frame structure is a description or a characteristic of a frame. A frame can be constructed, but a frame structure can only be described or shown. There is nothing ambiguous in the original sentences and the same language is used in multiple approved standards.

#I-10 Type: T TF: TF2 Clause: 5.2.6   Page: 37   Line: 13 Commenter: Rannow, R K / silverdraft supercomputing

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

The format and frame structure of the Organization-Specific VLCPDU with SUBTYPE_OUI24 shall be as depicted in Figure 5-6(a) and the format and frame structure of the VLCPDU with SUBTYPE_OUI36 shall be as depicted in Figure 5-6(b).
The format and frame structure of the Organization-Specific VLCPDU with SUBTYPE_OUI24 shall be constructed as described by Figure 5-6(a) and the format and frame structure of the VLCPDU with SUBTYPE_OUI36 shall constructed as described by Figure 5-6(b).
Both frame format and frame structure are characteristics of a frame. A frame can be constructed, but a frame format and frame structure can only be described or shown. There is nothing ambiguous in the original sentences and the same language is used in multiple approved standards.

#I-13 Type: TR TF: TF2 Clause: 5.3 Page: 39 Line: 11 Commenter: Laubach, Mark / IEEE member / Self Employed

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

VLAN Tagging (tags) for Ethernet Frames is standardized in IEEE 802.1Q. This draft neither references this standard nor states that the use of "VLAN tags" and the 32-bit size of each is purely by coincidence.

Consider changing line 12 "one or two VLAN tags" -> "one or two VLAN tags as defined in IEEE 802.1Q-2018" or equivalent footnote, etc.

Changed page 39, line 12 text "one or two VLAN tags" -> "one or two VLAN tags, as defined in IEEE Std 802.1Q" Added reference to IEEE Std 802.1Q in Clause 2.

#I-14 Type: TR TF: TF2 Clause: 6.2.1.2 Page: 44 Line: 0 Commenter: Laubach, Mark / IEEE member / Self Employed

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

In Table 6-3, for the REPLACE action, the target_field and field_value may be of different sizes. This was covered ok for the COPY action.

Add "The result is also undefined if the target_field and field_value are not of the same size." after the end of sentence ending in "present in the frame".

This is a good observation. However, the format of CTE Rule TLV ensures that the sizes of field_value and the target_field are the same. Applied the following modifications: 1) Add the following text to REPLACE operation in Table 6-3:"The CTE Rule TLV (see 8.1.3) ensures that the width of the<se> field_value</se> matches the width of the<se> target_field</se> field. 2) Add the following footnote to table 8-4 (attached to "V"):b) The length _V_ of<se> Value</se> field shall be as shown in Table 6-2 for the field identified by the<se> FieldId</se> value. Add PICS. 3) increment existing footnotes b and c

---

#I-15 Type: TR TF: TF2 Clause: 6.2.3 Page: 46 Line: 4 Commenter: Laubach, Mark / IEEE member / Self Employed

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

Similarly to prior comment on VLAN tages, Multiple VLAN 4 Registration Protocol (MVRP) needs a reference also.

Add "as defined in IEEE 802.1Q-2018" or equivalent footnote, etc. appropriately.

Changed page 46, line 5 text "Registration Protocol (MVRP)" -> "Registration Protocol (MVRP), as defined in IEEE Std 802.1Q" Added reference to IEEE Std 802.1Q in Clause 2.

#I-16 Type: E TF: TF2 Clause: 6.3.1 Page: 46 Line: 29 Commenter: Laubach, Mark / IEEE member / Self Employed

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

"4.3.1.4.2" needs to be a proper cross-reference

Make it so.

-

#I-18 Type: E TF: TF2 Clause: - Page: 50 Line: - Commenter: Laubach, Mark / IEEE member / Self Employed

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

This is odd on search. If I use normal Acrobat find for "RxOutputPdu.ReplaceField", it highlights "OAMPDURxOutputPdu.ReplaceField" (part of title and first action line in CONVERT_INTO_OAMPDU, and separately, the second occurrence. If I search for "RxOutputPdu.ReplaceField" using Advanced Search (whole word, case sensitive), only the second occurence is listed.

No change requested specifically. However, I wonder if there is a formatting issue?

This is an artifact of Adobe Acrobat way of embedding of vector graphics image. No change needed

---

#I-19 Type: E TF: TF2 Clause: 6.4.3 Page: 52 Line: 2 Commenter: Laubach, Mark / IEEE member / Self Employed

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

All "6.3.3" on this page are not proper cross-references.

Make them so.

-

#I-20 Type: T TF: TF2 Clause: 7.2.2 Page: 56 Line: 0 Commenter: Laubach, Mark / IEEE member / Self Employed

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

Figure 7-1 introduces new visual symbols in the colored rectangles that are like two arrowheads pointing inward at each other. Please find a way to label these. Also suggest that if there is some visual consistency with Figures 6-2 and 6-3, make them consistent. Ahh, I see Figure 8A-1 has labels....

Choose a way to label consistently and/or define.

A better solution was to add these symbols to Figure 6-2 and 6-3, where tunnels are first introduced, and to add a description to these figures stating that in these and subsequent figures, the symbol >< represents the operations of converting VLCPDUs into an xPDUs and xPDUs into VLCPDUs. No changes to Figure 7-1/2/3 are needed.

#I-11 Type: T TF: TF2 Clause: 8.1.1 Page: 60 Line: 8 Commenter: Rannow, R K / silverdraft supercomputing

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

The VLC_CONFIG VLCPDU format shall be as depicted in Figure 8-1 ambiguous and confusing.

The VLC_CONFIG VLCPDU format shall be constructed as described by Figure 8-1

The frame format is a description or a characteristic of a frame. A frame can be constructed, but a frame format can only be described or shown. There is nothing ambiguous in the original sentences and the same language is used in multiple approved standards.

#I-21 Type: E TF: TF2 Clause: 8A1.2.1 Page: 85 Line: 0 Commenter: Laubach, Mark / IEEE member / Self Employed

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

Table 8A-2 Descriptions have inconsistent use of a period '.' to end what appears to be a sentence that doesn't end in a cross-reference. E.g., see MsgSequence versus RuleTLVs S. There are others also. Same for Table 8A-4, 8A-6, 8A-8, 8A-10, 8A-12.

Make consistent.

Removed all "." at the end of statements in all tables in Annex 8A

#I-23 Type: T TF: TF2 Clause: 8A.4 Page: 100 Line: 16 Commenter: Laubach, Mark / IEEE member / Self Employed

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

header and line 32. ITU "PON" is not defined either. May need an entry in 3.2. May need a reference to the appropriate ITU-T standard(s) if it is clear. Also make clear what stanards ITU-T PON refer to. For example, I see it as a family of standards under development by ITU-T Q2/SG15. Relevant othe rnames/labels are summarized in https://www.itu.int/en/ITU-T/studygroups/2017-2020/15/Documents/OFC2018-2-Q2_v5.pdf   Said differently ITU-T PON is not just GPON.

Different ways to resolve this and the other my other two comments on this page.

Added "ITU-T PON" to definitions: ITU-T PON architecture as defined in ITU-T G.98x series of recommendations.

#I-22	Type: TR	TF: TF2	Clause: 8A.4	Page: 100	Line: 21	Commenter: Laubach, Mark / IEEE member / Self Employed

Comment Status: Resolved | Response Status: AIP | Commenter Satisfaction: Satisfied | Category: GPON

This is the first occurrence of "GPON" in the draft. May need an entry in 3.2. Needs a reference to the relevant ITU-T standard(s); e.g, ITU-T G.984. Also consider changing from "GPON" to "G-PON" to match ITU-T references.

Add to acronyms if needed and/or expand on first use. Add the relevant references to the ITU-T standard(s). Might be fixed in another of my comments.

Struck the only instance of "GPON" in the document.

#I-24	Type: TR	TF: TF2	Clause: 8A.4	Page: 100	Line: 21	Commenter: Laubach, Mark / IEEE member / Self Employed

Comment Status: Resolved | Response Status: AIP | Commenter Satisfaction: Satisfied | Category: GPON

Back to only stating "GPON" as OMCI also is used with XG-PON. I see there is a note in the acronyms table for G.988 (11/2017) that says "G-PON Gigabit-capable Passive Optical Network NOTE – See [ITU-T G.984.x]. Unless explicitly stated otherwise, this term also refers generically to [ITU-T G.987] XG-PON". Am recommending putting something similar into this draft.

Easiest path: put "G-PON" into the 3.2 list and add a similar note "G-PON Gigabit-capable Passive Optical Network NOTE – See [ITU-T G.984.x]. This term also refers generically to [ITU-T G.987] XG-PON"" or put it in a a footnote on page 11 to G-PON, or equivalent. Add G.984.x and G.987 to the list of normative rerernces as needed.

Struck the only instance of "GPON" in the document.

#I-2	Type: E	TF: TF2	Clause: 8a.5.1	Page: 104	Line: 15	Commenter: Noll, Kevin / Vecima

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

Misspelling - Illistrate should be illustrate

Replace Illistrate with illustrate

-

#I-3	Type: E	TF: TF2	Clause: 8A.5.2	Page: 105	Line: 5	Commenter: Noll, Kevin / Vecima

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

grammar/plurality error - "In case of a VLC-aware ONUs" should be "In the case of VLC-aware ONUs" or "In the case of a VLC-aware ONU"

Change "In case of a VLC-aware ONUs" to "In the case of a VLC-aware ONU"

-

#I-4	Type: E	TF: TF2	Clause: 8A.5.2	Page: 106	Line: 2	Commenter: Noll, Kevin / Vecima

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

grammar/plurality error - "In case of a VLC-unaware ONUs,"

Change "In case of a VLC-unaware ONUs," to "In the case of a VLC-unaware ONU"

-

#I-5	Type: E	TF: TF2	Clause: 8A.5.2	Page: 106	Line: 2	Commenter: Noll, Kevin / Vecima

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

Spelling - "respondible"

Change "respondible" to "responsible"

-