| \#276456 | Type: T | TF: TF2 | Clause: 8A. 5 | Page: | Line: - |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |



\#277383 Type: T TF: TF2 Clause: $5.3 \quad$ Page: $39 \quad$ Line: 11 Commenter: Laubach, Mark/IEEE member / Self Employed
Comment Status: New Response Status: None Commenter Satisfaction: None 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.


| \#277389 | Type: E | TF: TF2 | Clause: 6.4 .3 | Page: 52 | Line: 2 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Commenter: Laubach, Mark / IEEE member / Self Employed |  |  |  |  |  |
| Comment Status: New | Response Status: None | Commenter Satisfaction: None | Category: - |  |  |

Response Status. None Commenter Satisfaction: None Category:
All "6.3.3" on this page are not proper cross-references.
Make them so.

| $\# 277390$ | Type: T | TF: TF2 Clause: 7.2.2 | Page: $56 \quad$ Line: 0 Commenter: Laubach, Mark / IEEE member / Self Employed |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Comment Status: New | Response Status: None | Commenter Satisfaction: None |  |

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

| \#277136 Type: T | TF: TF2 Clause: 8.1.1 | Page: 60 Line: 8 Commenter: Rannow, R K / silverdraft supercomputing Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: - |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Comment Status: New | Response Status: None |  |  |
| 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 |  |  |  |
| - |  |  |  |


| \#277391 Type: E | TF: TF2 | Clause: 8A1.2.1 | Page: 85 | Line: 0 | Commenter: Laubach, Mark / IEEE member / Self Employed |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Comment Status: New | Response Status: None | Commenter Satisfaction: None | Category: - |  |  |

 S. There are others also. Same for Table 8A-4, 8A-6, 8A-8, 8A-10, 8A-12.

Make consistent.
\#277393 Type: T TF: TF2 Clause: 8A.4 Page: 100 Line: 16 Commenter: Laubach, Mark / IEEE member / Self Employed

Comment Status: New Response Status: None Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: -
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.
\#277394 Type: T TF: TF2 Clause: 8A. 4 Page: 100 Line: 21 Commenter: Laubach, Mark / IEEE member / Self Employed
Comment Status: New Response Status: None Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: -

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.
 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.


