#13   Type: ER   TF: TF2   Clause: 0   Page: 0   Line: 0   Commenter: Marek Hajduczenia / Charter

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

Page numbering needs to be fixed - page in PDF does not match page numberign displayed
Per comment
-

#10   Type: E   TF: TF2   Clause: 3.5   Page: 18   Line: 20   Commenter: Marek Hajduczenia / Charter

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

Text in yellow will need to be replaced with specific PICS example, once PICS are available.
Add editorial comment in front of the text marked in yellow to read as follows: "Editorial Note (to be removed prior to publication): The following text in yellow needs to be replaced with a valid example of PICS, once PICS become available."
-

#1   Type: TR   TF: TF2   Clause: 4.1   Page: 21   Line: 8   Commenter: Pradeep Kondamuri / Ciena

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

the UMT client is also optional, isn't it?
"Both UMT client and UMT sublayer are optional…."
-

#2   Type: ER   TF: TF2   Clause: 4.1   Page: 21   Line: 20   Commenter: Pradeep Kondamuri / Ciena

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

typo
change UPTPDUs to UMTPDUs
-

#11   Type: E   TF: TF2   Clause: 4.1   Page: 21   Line: 20   Commenter: Marek Hajduczenia / Charter

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

UPTPDU should be UMTPDU
Change globally
See also comment #2

#3   Type: TR   TF: TF2   Clause: 5.1   Page: 24   Line: 13   Commenter: Pradeep Kondamuri / Ciena

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

A note about source device should be added, similar to the one added for destination device in line 11
On line 15 add, "Note that the source device may not be UMT aware and the UMT tunnel may be originated after the frame leaves that device."
It is not clear why Source Address would be used for a non-UMT device.

#12   Type: TR   TF: TF2   Clause: 5.2   Page: 25   Line: 7   Commenter: Marek Hajduczenia / Charter

Comment Status: Proposed   Response Status: Accept   Commenter Satisfaction: None   Category: 0x07

Incorrect range "0x05 to 0xFD"
Change to "0x07 to 0xFD" to match the value in previous row
See also comment #4

#4   Type: ER   TF: TF2   Clause: 5.2   Page: 25   Line: 7   Commenter: Pradeep Kondamuri / Ciena

Comment Status: Proposed   Response Status: Accept   Commenter Satisfaction: None   Category: 0x07

typo in the Value column of penultimate row of the table
change "0x05 to 0xFD" to "0x07 to 0xFD"
-

#14   Type: TR   TF: TF2   Clause: 5.3   Page: 29   Line: 9   Commenter: Marek Hajduczenia / Charter

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

I do seem to recall material on VLAN tagged UMTPDUs haveinb been presented by Glen before. Is there any chance we can roll it into the next version of the dratf as a strawman proposal and see whether it generates any positive feedback?
Per comment
No specific changes to the draft at this time. Likely a review of Glen's proposal would be nice.

#5   Type: T   TF: TF2   Clause: 5.3   Page: 29   Line: 11   Commenter: Pradeep Kondamuri / Ciena

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

I think VLAN tags should be allowed, particularly useful in VLAN-based forwarding of UMTPDUs over multiple UMT-unaware Ethernet hops
-
No proposed change to the draft.

#6   Type: T   TF: TF2   Clause: 5.3   Page: 29   Line: 12   Commenter: Pradeep Kondamuri / Ciena

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

Going by 802.1Q frame format, the VLAN tag goes before the UMT Ethertype
-
The problem, while not described correctly in the note in the draft, is whether to transfer original VLAN tag as part of UMTPDU or not.

#15	Type: TR	TF: TF2	Clause: 6.2.1.2	Page: 34	Line: 19	Commenter: Marek Hajduczenia / Charter

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

Content missing
Use tf2_d0_4_hajduczenia_1.docx
-

#16	Type: TR	TF: TF2	Clause: 6.2.1.3	Page: 35	Line: 2	Commenter: Marek Hajduczenia / Charter

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

Content missing
It is not clear to me how to rebuild the original L3 frame from UMTPDU - the original frame would include DA/SA information, which is not propagated correctly across the UMTPDU - the default gateway may live beyond the ingress point for UMPTDU, and its MAC address is lost traversing the UMT link. Changes to L3 type UMTPDU will be be likely needed to address this problem as well.
No changes to the draft for now.

#7	Type: ER	TF: TF2	Clause: 6.2.2	Page: 35	Line: 4	Commenter: Pradeep Kondamuri / Ciena

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

The description of ingress tunnel entrance rules is incorrect; the current description is just a copy/paste of ingress tunnel exit rules in 6.2.1
-
-

#8	Type: T	TF: TF2	Clause: 7.1	Page: 39	Line: 1	Commenter: Pradeep Kondamuri / Ciena

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

Does the message sequence number imply any kind of message reassembly? Perhaps an example can help.
-
-

#9	Type: ER	TF: TF2	Clause: 7.2	Page: 40	Line: 1	Commenter: Pradeep Kondamuri / Ciena

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

I think the value 'N' in table 7-3 is not the same as value 'N' used elsewhere in the document. If it is not, use a different alphabet to represent it
-
-