

# IEEE\_P802-1CF\_D1-0 Network Reference Model and Functional Description of IEEE 802 Access Network

CL: 01	SC: 1.1	P: 13	L: 390	#
Comment Type: E    Comment Status: D    Commenter: Walter Pienciak The scope text as provided in the PAR can be editorially cleaned up (allowed). Suggested Remedy: Change text to: "This Recommended Practice specifies an access network, which connects terminals to their access routers, utilizing technologies based on the family of IEEE 802 Standards. It provides an access network reference model, including entities and reference points along with behavioral and functional descriptions of communications among those entities." Proposed Response:    Response Status: W PROPOSED ACCEPT.				
CL: 02	SC: 2	P: 14	L: 406	#
Comment Type: TR    Comment Status: D    Commenter: Paul Bottorff Material from IEEE Std 802 and IEEE Std 802.1X are used but not included in normative references Suggested Remedy: Add 802 and 802.1X to normative references Proposed Response:    Response Status: W PROPOSED ACCEPT.				
CL: 02	SC: 2	P: 14	L: 406	#
Comment Type: T    Comment Status: D    Commenter: Paul Bottorff The draft uses Network Access Identifiers and Fully Qualified Domain Names, however does not provide a reference to their definitions and use. Suggested Remedy: Add normative references to RFCs 1035 and 7542 and reference them the first time these terms are used in each clause. Proposed Response:    Response Status: W PROPOSED ACCEPT.				
CL: 02	SC: 2	P: 14	L: 406	#
Comment Type: T    Comment Status: X    Commenter: Paul Bottorff The draft makes reference to the use of Operation Support Systems and Business Support Systems, however does not provide a reference to their descriptions Suggested Remedy: Add an appropriate reference Proposed Response:    Response Status: O input needed				
CL: 02	SC: 2	P: 14	L: 410	#
Comment Type: TR    Comment Status: D    Commenter: Paul Congdon I believe 802.1X should be added to the list Suggested Remedy: Add 802.1X Proposed Response:    Response Status: W PROPOSED ACCEPT.				

# IEEE\_P802-1CF\_D1-0 Network Reference Model and Functional Description of IEEE 802 Access Network

CL: 03	SC: 3	P: 15	L: 423	#
Comment Type: E    Comment Status: X    Commenter: Paul Bottorff Defined terms should be in bold type followed by any acronym Suggested Remedy: Update draft style Proposed Response:    Response Status: O Walter to clarify with staff editor				
CL: 03	SC: 3	P: 15	L: 423	#
Comment Type: T    Comment Status: X    Commenter: Paul Bottorff The term "terminal" and "host" are used without providing a definition. It appears these terms are used to differentiate between different types of devices contain an end station and terminating the L3 dialog, however it is not clear what the difference is between a terminal and a host. Suggested Remedy: Define a terminal and if necessary a host showing what the difference or if they are the same thing then indicate they are the same or eliminate one of them from the draft. Proposed Response:    Response Status: W input needed				
CL: 03	SC: 3	P: 15	L: 423	#
Comment Type: TR    Comment Status: X    Commenter: Paul Bottorff Definition of access network is vague and does not clearly identify what makes an access network different than any 802 LAN/MAN with a router. It seems the access provided by the access network is to a service provider facility through an access router, however this does not appear to be a requirement of the definition. Since the only 802 LAN/MANs that don't provide L2 access between terminals and hosts are those which interconnect only routes or other higher layer non-terminating interworking devices. Suggested Remedy: Clarify the definition by defining what is meant by terminal and host. For instance: Access network denotes an 802 LAN/MAN providing layer 2 connectivity between terminals(hosts) and service provider access routers. Proposed Response:    Response Status: W input needed				
CL: 03	SC: 3	P: 15	L: 425	#
Comment Type: TR    Comment Status: D    Commenter: Paul Bottorff There is no link from the terminal. What is extended over the access network is a MAC service instance which is terminated at the access router Suggested Remedy: Remove the term link from the definition and replace with MAC service instance Proposed Response:    Response Status: W PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. replace by 'connectivity'				
CL: 03	SC: 3	P: 15	L: 427	#
Comment Type: T    Comment Status: D    Commenter: Paul Bottorff IEEE 802.1 has is using the term stream rather than flow which is a defined term in 802.1Q-2018 subclause 3.256 Suggested Remedy: Replace flow with stream everywhere Proposed Response:    Response Status: W PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. remove flow completely				

# IEEE\_P802-1CF\_D1-0 Network Reference Model and Functional Description of IEEE 802 Access Network

CL: 03	SC: 3	P: 15	L: 429	#
<p>Comment Type: T      Comment Status: D      Commenter: Paul Congdon</p> <p>A datapath element is used to define this term path, but a datapath element is an unclear term</p> <p>Suggested Remedy:</p> <p>Either define this term or use a different description similar to terms used in other 802 documents</p> <p>Proposed Response:      Response Status: W</p> <p>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</p> <p>same as comment #10</p>				
CL: 03	SC: 3	P: 15	L: 429	#
<p>Comment Type: T      Comment Status: D      Commenter: Paul Bottorff</p> <p>The definition of path relies on the less well defined "dataplane elements". Perhaps the path is through dataplane entity instances or simply through devices.</p> <p>Suggested Remedy:</p> <p>Strike the path definition</p> <p>Proposed Response:      Response Status: W</p> <p>PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.</p> <p>define datapath instead</p>				
CL: 03	SC: 3	P: 15	L: 430	#
<p>Comment Type: TR      Comment Status: D      Commenter: Paul Congdon</p> <p>The term 'user session' is used quite extensively in clause 7 of the document and would seem to warrant a definition. I believe there are other relevant terms, but this one comes to mind</p> <p>Suggested Remedy:</p> <p>Add a definition for user session. It seems that the definition should have something to do with the period of time a station is accessing the network. The definition could include the time in between phases shown in Figure 30</p> <p>Proposed Response:      Response Status: W</p> <p>PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.</p> <p>try to reduce to 'session'</p>				
CL: 04	SC: 4	P: 16	L: 431	#
<p>Comment Type: TR      Comment Status: D      Commenter: Paul Bottorff</p> <p>Fully Qualified Domain Name (FQDN) is missing from the acronyms list but is used in the text</p> <p>Suggested Remedy:</p> <p>add</p> <p>Proposed Response:      Response Status: W</p> <p>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</p>				
CL: 04	SC: 4.1	P: 16	L: 434	#
<p>Comment Type: ER      Comment Status: D      Commenter: Max Riegel</p> <p>"ANI" is never used throughout document. Instead AN-ID is used for Access Network Identifier</p> <p>Suggested Remedy:</p> <p>Remove entry in list of acronyms, as all the others 'xx-ID' do not appear as well.</p> <p>Proposed Response:      Response Status: W</p> <p>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</p>				

# IEEE\_P802-1CF\_D1-0 Network Reference Model and Functional Description of IEEE 802 Access Network

CL: 04	SC: 4.1	P: 17	L: 460	#
Comment Type: ER    Comment Status: D    Commenter: Max Riegel "SSI" is never used throughout document. Suggested Remedy: Remove entry in list of acronyms. Proposed Response:    Response Status: W PROPOSED ACCEPT.				
CL: 04	SC: 4.2.2	P: 17	L: 473	#
Comment Type: ER    Comment Status: D    Commenter: Glenn Parsons What is "simplified UML"? That is why does the structure notation have to be explained here? I don't think we do that for UML usage in other 802.1 standards. Suggested Remedy: Delete this section and reference a standard UML version. EG. 802.1AE reference UML 2.0 Proposed Response:    Response Status: W PROPOSED ACCEPT. move 4.2.2 into an informative annex referenced in section 8. Insert a statement that information model is based on UML 2.0 with normative reference in the normative reference section.				
CL: 04	SC: 4.2.2.1	P: 17	L: 478	#
Comment Type: TR    Comment Status: D    Commenter: Max Riegel Figure of class notation does not comply with the figures used in chapter 8 Suggested Remedy: Align figure 1 to notations used in chapter 8. Introduce 'occurrence' in class notation, explain '/' as denotation of comments, and show 'result' in front of functionname. Proposed Response:    Response Status: W PROPOSED ACCEPT.				
CL: 04	SC: 4.2.2.4	P: 19	L: 510	#
Comment Type: E    Comment Status: D    Commenter: Paul Bottorff show -> shows Suggested Remedy: change word Proposed Response:    Response Status: W PROPOSED ACCEPT.				
CL: 05	SC: 5	P: 20	L: 519	#
Comment Type: TR    Comment Status: X    Commenter: Paul Congdon Perhaps this has already been agreed to, but it is entirely appropriate for a Recommended Practice to have conformance statements. In fact, most of the Functional Requirements in clause 7 are written in terms of 'should' and 'shall' statements. The words 'should' and 'shall' are used frequently. Also, Clause 2 is titled 'Normative References', but what is normative if there is no conformance. Suggested Remedy: Include a conformance and PICs. Proposed Response:    Response Status: O editorial clean-up of 'shall' necessary; PICS are clearly out of scope, but conformance statements may be possible ==>further study needed.				

# IEEE\_P802-1CF\_D1-0 Network Reference Model and Functional Description of IEEE 802 Access Network

CL: 06	SC: 6	P: 21	L: 529	#
<p>Comment Type: E    Comment Status: D    Commenter: Paul Congdon</p> <p>The term 'switch' is used fairly frequently, but in 802.1 we strive to use the term 'bridge'.</p> <p>Suggested Remedy:</p> <p>Either provide a definition or use terminology that is consistent with 802.1. I would prefer to see 802.1 terminology used when possible</p> <p>Proposed Response:    Response Status: W</p> <p>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</p> <p>replace switch by 'bridge' in section 6</p>				
CL: 06	SC: 6	P: 21	L: 537	#
<p>Comment Type: ER    Comment Status: D    Commenter: Paul Congdon</p> <p>It is unclear what figure is being referenced as there is no figure number</p> <p>Suggested Remedy:</p> <p>I think this is referecing Figure 7, so include the number. Also that figure really has two figures, so split it accordingly</p> <p>Proposed Response:    Response Status: W</p> <p>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</p>				
CL: 06	SC: 6.1	P: 21	L: 540	#
<p>Comment Type: ER    Comment Status: X    Commenter: Jessy Rouyer</p> <p>The "adoption" of 802.1AC clause 7 and of some figures from 802 results in a lot of text duplication in this subclause 6.1, which could become a maintenance burden in the future.</p> <p>Suggested Remedy:</p> <p>Refer to clause 7 (and use "clause" terminology rather than "chapter throughout the draft) and to 802 figures as needed to avoid duplication. More generally, if other text from 802.1AC or other standards are copied in this document, replace the copies with references to appropriate sub/clauses of these other standards. I suppose for example that 7.6.1.4 could be simplified by referencing 802.1Qcc.</p> <p>Proposed Response:    Response Status: O</p> <p>requires discussion with Jessy; adoption of clause instead of section or chapter is fine.</p>				
CL: 06	SC: 6.1	P: 21	L: 541	#
<p>Comment Type: E    Comment Status: D    Commenter: Paul Congdon</p> <p>In general, there seems to be a lot of material in this document that is summarizing or paraphrasing the contents of other standards. This note states that explicitly. It would be good if more material was referenced rather than having so much background content re-documenting existing standards.</p> <p>Suggested Remedy:</p> <p>This proposed resolution is not explicitly actionable, but a general recommendation. Reference as much material as possible instead of re-writing it in different terms. A small amount of explanatory text is relevant for setting the context of recommended practice, but it feels like there is more than enough here.</p> <p>Proposed Response:    Response Status: W</p> <p>PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.</p> <p>Minimum: Move relevant text of 802.1AC into an annex and insert reference to annex into the text. Clarification to be seeked on rationale for 802.1X-2010 to insert normative annex.</p>				
CL: 06	SC: 6.1.1	P: 22	L: 560	#
<p>Comment Type: TR    Comment Status: D    Commenter: Glenn Parsons</p> <p>This figure is copied from IEEE Std 802 without attribution</p> <p>Suggested Remedy:</p> <p>All Figures copied from other IEEE 802 standards MUST be attribtued in the text and referenced. There are more from IEEE Std 802 and likely some from other standards</p> <p>Proposed Response:    Response Status: W</p> <p>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</p> <p>Commented section will be removed from the main body. However, comment will be taken into account for the few other occurences of copied figures from other standards.</p>				

# IEEE\_P802-1CF\_D1-0 Network Reference Model and Functional Description of IEEE 802 Access Network

CL: 06	SC: 6.1.2	P: 23	L: 572	#
<p>Comment Type: T      Comment Status: D      Commenter: Antonio de la Oliva</p> <p>Fig.9 the arrows are following the convention of diagrams in the section 4, or has nothing to do? it is confusing</p> <p>Suggested Remedy:</p> <p>To me it is confusing but I can live with it</p> <p>Proposed Response:      Response Status: W</p> <p>PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.</p> <p>Figure 9 will be removed from the main body. In addition, UML notation introduction will move to informative annex.</p>				
CL: 06	SC: 6.1.5	P: 25	L: 620	#
<p>Comment Type: T      Comment Status: D      Commenter: Antonio de la Oliva</p> <p>Not sure if media independent is the best word here, please check if this is used in other standards</p> <p>Suggested Remedy:</p> <p>If it is used none, if it is not use the term use in other standards</p> <p>Proposed Response:      Response Status: W</p> <p>PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.</p> <p>Text is copied from 802.1AC specification. Will be removed from main body.</p>				
CL: 06	SC: 6.1.8	P: 26	L: 644	#
<p>Comment Type: T      Comment Status: D      Commenter: Antonio de la Oliva</p> <p>Is the connection less characteristic true for all IEEE 802 technologies, for example for .16?</p> <p>Suggested Remedy:</p> <p>Just not sure</p> <p>Proposed Response:      Response Status: W</p> <p>PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.</p> <p>802.1AC MAC service is connectionless on all IEEE 802 technologies. ==&gt; check text when moved into annex.</p>				
CL: 06	SC: 6.2.1	P: 26	L: 668	#
<p>Comment Type: ER      Comment Status: D      Commenter: Pat Thaler</p> <p>Some figures are not referenced by the text. All figures should have a reference in the related text. For example, Figures 12 and 13.</p> <p>Suggested Remedy:</p> <p>check that all figures have text references and add where needed.</p> <p>Proposed Response:      Response Status: W</p> <p>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</p> <p>Agreed. All figures will be explicitly referenced in the text.</p>				
CL: 06	SC: 6.3	P: 28	L: 703	#
<p>Comment Type: T      Comment Status: D      Commenter: Weiying Cheng</p> <p>Both Terminal and Access Router define interfaces, should AN also define interfaces to Terminal Interface and AR interface?</p> <p>Suggested Remedy:</p> <p>Add interfaces within AN to interface with terminal and AR</p> <p>Proposed Response:      Response Status: W</p> <p>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</p> <p>Doc 18-0007-01 provides updated figures for fig 14 &amp;15</p>				

# IEEE\_P802-1CF\_D1-0 Network Reference Model and Functional Description of IEEE 802 Access Network

CL: 06	SC: 6.3.1.1	P: 29	L: 717	#
<p>Comment Type: T    Comment Status: D    Commenter: Walter Pienciak</p> <p>not all terminals in the scope of this section are mobile devices</p> <p>Suggested Remedy:</p> <p>Change text from "The terminal is a mobile device that seeks" to "The terminal is a device that seeks"</p> <p>Proposed Response:    Response Status: W</p> <p>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</p>				
CL: 06	SC: 6.3.1.1	P: 29	L: 717	#
<p>Comment Type: T    Comment Status: D    Commenter: Weiying Cheng</p> <p>Why just a mobile device? Fixed device can also be used for terminal</p> <p>Suggested Remedy:</p> <p>Add fixed device.</p> <p>Proposed Response:    Response Status: W</p> <p>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</p> <p>agreed ; same as comment #141</p>				
CL: 06	SC: 6.3.1.1	P: 29	L: 726	#
<p>Comment Type: T    Comment Status: X    Commenter: Weiying Cheng</p> <p>Are you saying ANC is Element Manager that is used to manage node? this is contract to central control. An Element Manager does not need to have network view and only used to manage node (NE), but central controller for AN need to have network view of the access network, so what exact ANC is intent to do?</p> <p>Suggested Remedy:</p> <p>Clarfy what ANC is intended to control</p> <p>Proposed Response:    Response Status: W</p> <p>agreed, but text proposal needed for amendment. Avoid the term 'element manager' as it is too restrictive and misleading</p>				
CL: 06	SC: 6.3.1.3	P: 29	L: 729	#
<p>Comment Type: TR    Comment Status: D    Commenter: Paul Congdon</p> <p>The phrase, "an anchor for the network" is not very clear to me. I don't understand from this phrase what specific services the router is providing.</p> <p>Suggested Remedy:</p> <p>Either define what an anchor is or describe the access router's role in terms of the specific IP services that it is offering (e.g. IP forwarding, DHCP, DNS proxy, etc )</p> <p>Proposed Response:    Response Status: W</p> <p>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</p> <p>Rephrase to '... by providing network layer communication toward the terminal side.'</p>				
CL: 06	SC: 6.3.2	P: 30	L: 755	#
<p>Comment Type: T    Comment Status: D    Commenter: Weiying Cheng</p> <p>Is R3 covered by IEEE standards, same as R1?</p> <p>Suggested Remedy:</p> <p>If same as R1, add IEEE</p> <p>Proposed Response:    Response Status: W</p> <p>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</p> <p>Replace sentence by: R3 represents the link for the communication between the access network and the access router as specified by IEEE 802 standards.</p>				

# IEEE\_P802-1CF\_D1-0 Network Reference Model and Functional Description of IEEE 802 Access Network

CL: 06	SC: 6.3.2	P: 30	L: 763	#
<p>Comment Type: T      Comment Status: D      Commenter: Weiyang Cheng</p> <p>If R9 can be over R3, can R8 over R2?</p> <p>Suggested Remedy:</p> <p>If so, add clarification</p> <p>Proposed Response:      Response Status: W</p> <p>PROPOSED REJECT.</p> <p>R2 terminates in the subscription service. R8 terminates in the ANC. It is not feasible to convey R8 over R2 as both endpoints belong to different entities.</p>				
CL: 06	SC: 6.3.2.1	P: 29	L: 750	#
<p>Comment Type: TR      Comment Status: D      Commenter: Paul Congdon</p> <p>The definition of the R1 reference point is in terms of establishing the 'physical port', but the figure only a single reference point instead of two (one on each end), and the port isn't established by this reference point, the reference point may be. Aren't we really talking about the 'link' between two ports as the reference point? It would seem more appropriate to be discussing the link and characteristics of the link as the reference point</p> <p>Suggested Remedy:</p> <p>Either show two R1 reference points as 'ports', or change the definition to be in terms of the 'link' between the two end-points.</p> <p>Proposed Response:      Response Status: W</p> <p>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</p> <p>Replace 'physical port' through 'link'</p>				
CL: 06	SC: 6.4	P: 30	L: 778	#
<p>Comment Type: ER      Comment Status: D      Commenter: Jessy Rouyer</p> <p>Figure 15 is not referenced by any text. Other figures are in the same situation</p> <p>Suggested Remedy:</p> <p>Introduce all figures appropriately and provide references to them.</p> <p>Proposed Response:      Response Status: W</p> <p>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</p> <p>Covered by acceptance of comment ?#31 (Pat)</p>				
CL: 06	SC: 6.4	P: 30	L: 778	#
<p>Comment Type: T      Comment Status: D      Commenter: Weiyang Cheng</p> <p>For all those reference points over dashed lines, are those reference points covered by 802 standards? I assumed those solid line are covered by 802 standards, right?</p> <p>Suggested Remedy:</p> <p>Proposed Response:      Response Status: W</p> <p>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</p> <p>All reference points are covered by IEEE 802 standards. For control interfaces only information elements are defined by IEEE 802.</p> <p>Add sentence to emphasize that 'All reference points are covered by IEEE 802 standards. For control interfaces only information elements are defined within IEEE 802 standards.'</p>				
CL: 06	SC: 6.5	P: 31	L: 796	#
<p>Comment Type: E      Comment Status: D      Commenter: Paul Congdon</p> <p>I can appreciate that there are different levels of detail required in the reference model, but it seems unnecessary to replicate the reference models 3 times, adding in a bit more detail each time.</p> <p>Suggested Remedy:</p> <p>Consider trimming out some of the reference models and using only a single model to discuss things, indicating that some functions are not necessary in all environments. At a minimum, it would seem possible to just have two versions of the model, basic and comprehensive.</p> <p>Proposed Response:      Response Status: W</p> <p>PROPOSED REJECT.</p> <p>Discussion of the comment in the TG brought up desire for a more stepwise introduction of various complexities, in particular to guide unexperienced readers.</p>				



# IEEE\_P802-1CF\_D1-0 Network Reference Model and Functional Description of IEEE 802 Access Network

CL: 06	SC: 6.5	P: 31	L: 802	#
<p>Comment Type: ER    Comment Status: D    Commenter: Pat Thaler</p> <p>Lettering in many figures is blurry. E.g. Figure 16 and Figure 17</p> <p>Suggested Remedy:</p> <p>Fix it</p> <p>Proposed Response:    Response Status: W</p> <p>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</p> <p>agreed. Figures have to be changed to make text searchable.</p>				
CL: 06	SC: 6.6	P: 33	L: 836	#
<p>Comment Type: T    Comment Status: X    Commenter: Paul Bottorff</p> <p>Here is the first reference to OSS/BSS however it's use is not illustrated in the diagram (though later diagrams illustrate it)</p> <p>Suggested Remedy:</p> <p>Add OSS/BSS to diagram</p> <p>Proposed Response:    Response Status: O</p> <p>Agreed. Max to provide a proposal for acceptance</p>				
CL: 06	SC: 6.7	P: 33	L: 846	#
<p>Comment Type: TR    Comment Status: D    Commenter: Max Riegel</p> <p>List of identifiers is incomplete and exposes entries not used throughout specification</p> <p>Suggested Remedy:</p> <p>Adopt revision proposal: omniran-18-0002-00-CF00</p> <p>and change occurrence of identifiers in chapter 7 and 8 accordingly.</p> <p>Proposed Response:    Response Status: W</p> <p>PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.</p> <p>Revised document 18-0002-01 accepted</p>				
CL: 06	SC: 6.7	P: 34	L: 851	#
<p>Comment Type: TR    Comment Status: X    Commenter: Pat Thaler</p> <p>There is no provision for use of locally assigned addresses.</p> <p>Suggested Remedy:</p> <p>Allow for local MAC addresses in addition to EUIs</p> <p>Proposed Response:    Response Status: W</p> <p>Clarify which of the standards allow local MAC addresses; otherwise use note to make aware of potential use of local MAC address; Roger M. will provide revision of 18-0002-01 containing amendments to address Pat's comment.</p>				
CL: 06	SC: 6.7	P: 34	L: 852	#
<p>Comment Type: E    Comment Status: D    Commenter: Weiying Cheng</p> <p>Acronyms for FQDN?</p> <p>Suggested Remedy:</p> <p>Add acronyms of FQDN in Section 4</p> <p>Proposed Response:    Response Status: W</p> <p>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</p>				

# IEEE\_P802-1CF\_D1-0 Network Reference Model and Functional Description of IEEE 802 Access Network

CL: 06	SC: 6.7	P: 34	L: 852	#
<p>Comment Type: TR    Comment Status: D    Commenter: Weiying Cheng</p> <p>What type should be for those TE/AN/AR controller, etc that are empty in Type Column</p> <p>Suggested Remedy:</p> <p>Define types for those that do not have type defined yet</p> <p>Proposed Response:    Response Status: W</p> <p>PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.</p> <p>TE-Ctrl and AR-Ctrl removed from the list. ANC is already clearly explained</p>				
CL: 06	SC: 6.7	P: 34	L: 853	#
<p>Comment Type: E    Comment Status: D    Commenter: Paul Congdon</p> <p>Table 2 is incomplete. It does not show types for all rows.</p> <p>Suggested Remedy:</p> <p>Include types for all values, even if the identifier types are simply strings. There must be a normative definition of string identifiers in 802 standards</p> <p>Proposed Response:    Response Status: W</p> <p>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</p>				
CL: 06	SC: 6.7	P: 34	L: 853	#
<p>Comment Type: TR    Comment Status: D    Commenter: Paul Bottorff</p> <p>Here many acronyms are defined which should be included in the acronym list. In addition, many of the defined ID types are never used in the rest of the text and therefore un-necessary.</p> <p>Suggested Remedy:</p> <p>Remove all the _ID acronyms which are un-used in the draft. Add those which remain to the acronym list.</p> <p>Proposed Response:    Response Status: W</p> <p>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</p>				
CL: 06	SC: 6.7	P: 34	L: 855	#
<p>Comment Type: ER    Comment Status: D    Commenter: Paul Congdon</p> <p>Table 3 indicates it is discussion operation roles, but it shows an incomplete list of types for each role.</p> <p>Suggested Remedy:</p> <p>Update the table to indicate 'roles' as a column and define and describe what the roles mean</p> <p>Proposed Response:    Response Status: W</p> <p>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</p> <p>revised table according to operational roles explained in clause 6.6</p>				
CL: 06	SC: 6.7	P: 34	L: 855	#
<p>Comment Type: E    Comment Status: D    Commenter: Weiying Cheng</p> <p>Acronyms for NAI?</p> <p>Suggested Remedy:</p> <p>Add acronyms of NAI in Section 4</p> <p>Proposed Response:    Response Status: W</p> <p>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</p>				

# IEEE\_P802-1CF\_D1-0 Network Reference Model and Functional Description of IEEE 802 Access Network

CL: 06	SC: 6.7	P: 34	L: 855	#
<p>Comment Type: TR    Comment Status: D    Commenter: Weiying Cheng</p> <p>What type should be for those rows that are empty in Type Column</p> <p>Suggested Remedy:</p> <p>Define types for those that do not have type defined yet</p> <p>Proposed Response:    Response Status: W</p> <p>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</p> <p>accepted. Solved through 18-0002-01</p>				
CL: 06	SC: 6.8	P: 34	L: 856	#
<p>Comment Type: T    Comment Status: D    Commenter: Antonio de la Oliva</p> <p>This section equals network virtualization and slicing which imho are not exactly the same, slicing requires of isolation while virtualization as in 802 does not. In addition there is no real virtualization in the PHY of any 802 tech, should we discuss that?</p> <p>Suggested Remedy:</p> <p>Add this distinction and have some discussion on isolation of resources</p> <p>Proposed Response:    Response Status: W</p> <p>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</p> <p>Agreed that network virtualization is not identical to network slicing. Avoid use of 'network slicing'. (L857: remove 'often also called network slicing'; L939: remove '(network slices)'; L940: s/of the slices/instance; clean up NFV section</p>				
CL: 06	SC: 6.8	P: 34	L: 860	#
<p>Comment Type: T    Comment Status: D    Commenter: Paul Congdon</p> <p>I appreciate the simplifications made in discussing network virtualization - that it is simply an instantiation of the entire network element and all of its interfaces, etc.. However, I'm not sure if that simplification is accurate or is serving implementors. There are portions of the end-to-end topology where the virtualization may converge and not be represented as a complete instance of the network element. For example, at the router, multiple VLANs might be interconnected, but the router itself is not purely virtualized, but instead interconnecting the virtual networks. In this example, figure 22 might be shown with the Access Router planes flattened, but the virtual network planes instantiated as shown.</p> <p>Suggested Remedy:</p> <p>soften the discussion about how virtualization is achieved and do not indicate that the entire network element and all of its components, or the NMS itself, must be entirely replicated to support virtualization</p> <p>Proposed Response:    Response Status: W</p> <p>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</p> <p>change in line 859 network elements to 'access network elements'</p>				
CL: 06	SC: 6.8	P: 35	L: 867	#
<p>Comment Type: E    Comment Status: D    Commenter: Weiying Cheng</p> <p>suggest to say networks instead of links.</p> <p>Suggested Remedy:</p> <p>Replace links with networks</p> <p>Proposed Response:    Response Status: W</p> <p>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</p>				
CL: 06	SC: 6.8	P: 35	L: 876	#
<p>Comment Type: ER    Comment Status: D    Commenter: Paul Congdon</p> <p>Unclear what "carrying forward Ethernet frames" means. I think you are talking about bridge relay?</p> <p>Suggested Remedy:</p> <p>Describe the common operation in terms of definitions provided by 802.1. I think you are discussing 'frame forwarding' or 'bridge relay'</p> <p>Proposed Response:    Response Status: W</p> <p>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</p> <p>replace 'carrying forward' by 'relaying'</p>				

# IEEE\_P802-1CF\_D1-0 Network Reference Model and Functional Description of IEEE 802 Access Network

CL: 06	SC: 6.8	P: 35	L: 881	#
Comment Type: TR Comment Status: D Commenter: Paul Congdon				
This sentence is very assertive, but lacks the explanation or reference to its assertions. How is this true? Or, perhaps, is the statement really necessary and helpful in this context?				
Suggested Remedy:				
Suggest deleting the sentence or adding additional sentences to explain how virtual networks exist without network virtualization?				
Proposed Response: Response Status: W				
PROPOSED ACCEPT.				
Amend line 882 with: 'Network virtualization leads to multiple administrative domains'.				
CL: 06	SC: 6.8.1	P: 35	L: 887	#
Comment Type: E Comment Status: D Commenter: Paul Congdon				
The idea of network slices is easy enough to understand as depicted in Figure 22 where multiple slices are shown. We could accelerate the introduction of this context and skip the diagrams showing single instances				
Suggested Remedy:				
Consolidate or remove Figures 19 and 20 and just start with multiple instances to shorten the text.				
Proposed Response: Response Status: W				
PROPOSED REJECT.				
Discussion in the TG brought up agreement to maintain stepwise introduction of topics to better guide the reader.				
CL: 06	SC: 6.8.2	P: 37	L: 917	#
Comment Type: E Comment Status: D Commenter: Paul Congdon				
There seems to be a fair amount of discussion and reliance on the BSS/OSS in the architecture, but no definition or references to what this is. The acronyms are defined, but this is not sufficient. A reference document might be best				
Suggested Remedy:				
Include normative reference material for OSS/BSS or include an introductory paragraph on what the system is and where it is further described				
Proposed Response: Response Status: W				
PROPOSED ACCEPT.				
Accepted; explanation of OSS/BSS will be added with amendment of figure 18 (OSS/BSS to be shown with operational roles)				
CL: 06	SC: 6.8.2	P: 37	L: 921	#
Comment Type: T Comment Status: D Commenter: Antonio de la Oliva				
It seems the way the RAN talks with the orchestrator is through the CIS, I am not sure of that and I am not sure this follows the different discussions in ETSI NFV. Do we want to cite any ETSI NFV document?				
Suggested Remedy:				
Discuss in the meeting				
Proposed Response: Response Status: W				
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.				
The concerns are addressing information covered in clause 8.4, and should be documented there.				
CL: 06	SC: 6.8.2	P: 37	L: 921	#
Comment Type: T Comment Status: D Commenter: Antonio de la Oliva				
It seems the way the RAN talks with the orchestrator is through the CIS, I am not sure of that and I am not sure this follows the different discussions in ETSI NFV. Do we want to cite any ETSI NFV document?				
Suggested Remedy:				
Discuss in the meeting				
Proposed Response: Response Status: W				
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.				
The concerns are addressing information covered in clause 8.4, and should be documented there.				

# IEEE\_P802-1CF\_D1-0 Network Reference Model and Functional Description of IEEE 802 Access Network

CL: 06	SC: 6.8.3	P: 38	L: 930	#
Comment Type: E	Comment Status: D	Commenter: Walter Pienciak		
enumeration in text uses both "three" and "3" in a single context				
Suggested Remedy:				
Change text from "3 different" to "three different"				
Proposed Response:	Response Status: W			
PROPOSED ACCEPT.				
CL: 06	SC: 6.9.1	P: 39	L: 958	#
Comment Type: ER	Comment Status: D	Commenter: Paul Congdon		
Ethernet 'plug' is not a term we use in 802.1. I believe you mean 'port'				
Suggested Remedy:				
Change 'plug' to 'port' in all places in the document, starting here.				
Proposed Response:	Response Status: W			
PROPOSED ACCEPT.				
CL: 06	SC: 6.9.1	P: 39	L: 961	#
Comment Type: E	Comment Status: D	Commenter: Weiying Cheng		
use ports instead of plugs				
Suggested Remedy:				
Replace plugs with ports				
Proposed Response:	Response Status: W			
PROPOSED ACCEPT.				
CL: 06	SC: 6.9.1	P: 39	L: 968	#
Comment Type: E	Comment Status: D	Commenter: Paul Congdon		
This is one possible 'example' of a router schematic.				
Suggested Remedy:				
Include the term 'example' or 'possible' in the Figure title to indicate there are many other possible realizations.				
Proposed Response:	Response Status: W			
PROPOSED ACCEPT.				
ok. Wording will be modified accordingly				
CL: 06	SC: 6.9.1	P: 40	L: 973	#
Comment Type: T	Comment Status: D	Commenter: Antonio de la Oliva		
I think in IEEE 802.11 it is called portal not gateway				
Suggested Remedy:				
Change?				
Proposed Response:	Response Status: W			
PROPOSED REJECT.				
The sentence really talks about the NAT and routing function between LAN and WAN				

# IEEE\_P802-1CF\_D1-0 Network Reference Model and Functional Description of IEEE 802 Access Network

CL: 06	SC: 6.9.1	P: 40	L: 992	#
<p>Comment Type: ER    Comment Status: D    Commenter: Paul Congdon</p> <p>First time seeing TV WS as an acronym. Later it is defined (e.g. line 1210 and 1218)</p> <p>Suggested Remedy:</p> <p>Indicate what TV WS is, or say TV White Space instead</p> <p>Proposed Response:    Response Status: W</p> <p>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</p> <p>ok TV WS will be spelled out.</p>				
CL: 06	SC: 6.9.1 and all doc	P: 39	L: 949	#
<p>Comment Type: E    Comment Status: D    Commenter: Antonio de la Oliva</p> <p>Why do we say WiFi and not IEEE 802.11?</p> <p>Suggested Remedy:</p> <p>Change?</p> <p>Proposed Response:    Response Status: W</p> <p>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</p> <p>Replace Wi-Fi router by 'WLAN router' ; provide additional information how 802.11 NA is implemented partly in hardware and partly in software.</p>				
CL: 06	SC: 6.9.2	P: 41	L: 997	#
<p>Comment Type: E    Comment Status: D    Commenter: Walter Pienciak</p> <p>The sentence beginning "Illustrated in" is incomplete.</p> <p>Suggested Remedy:</p> <p>TG should clarify intent.</p> <p>Proposed Response:    Response Status: W</p> <p>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</p> <p>Amend 'This is illustrated...' to the beginning of the sentence.</p>				
CL: 06	SC: 6.9.2	P: 41	L: 998	#
<p>Comment Type: E    Comment Status: D    Commenter: Paul Congdon</p> <p>Are the ITU documents essential in understanding this document and should they be included in references?</p> <p>Suggested Remedy:</p> <p>Add to non-normative references or normative if they are essential</p> <p>Proposed Response:    Response Status: W</p> <p>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</p> <p>same comment as #16</p>				
CL: 06	SC: 6.9.2	P: 41	L: 998	#
<p>Comment Type: E    Comment Status: D    Commenter: Antonio de la Oliva</p> <p>Add references to ITU-T Y.2070, TTC TR1053</p> <p>Suggested Remedy:</p> <p>Proposed Response:    Response Status: W</p> <p>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</p>				

# IEEE\_P802-1CF\_D1-0 Network Reference Model and Functional Description of IEEE 802 Access Network

CL: 06	SC: 6.9.2	P: 41	L: 1024	#
<p>Comment Type: ER    Comment Status: D    Commenter: Paul Congdon</p> <p>This is really two figures</p> <p>Suggested Remedy:</p> <p>Split the figure into two figures as is done with future similar diagrams</p> <p>Proposed Response:    Response Status: W</p> <p>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</p> <p>denote figures</p>				
CL: 06	SC: 6.9.2	P: 42	L: 1027	#
<p>Comment Type: E    Comment Status: D    Commenter: Hao Wang</p> <p>A module of 'managed agent' is missing on the second device in Figure 25 (b).</p> <p>Suggested Remedy:</p> <p>as indicated in the comments</p> <p>Proposed Response:    Response Status: W</p> <p>PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.</p> <p>amend figure to show the two devices stacked on top of TE shape of NRM</p>				
CL: 06	SC: 6.9.2	P: 42	L: 1029	#
<p>Comment Type: E    Comment Status: D    Commenter: Weiying Cheng</p> <p>Does PF standard for PlatForm? It is not very clear. Suggest to say 'Management Platform (MP)', also update in Figure</p> <p>Suggested Remedy:</p> <p>Replace 'Management PF' with 'MP' in Figure 25 and 'management platform (FP)' with 'Management Platform (MP)'</p> <p>Proposed Response:    Response Status: W</p> <p>PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.</p> <p>Add explanation in caption of figure 25a together with explanation of HGW. Spell out Home Gateway throughout text. Insert complete reference to source of figure.</p> <p>Revise figure 25b to avoid acronyms shown in 25a.</p>				
CL: 06	SC: 6.9.3	P: 42	L: 1048	#
<p>Comment Type: E    Comment Status: D    Commenter: Paul Congdon</p> <p>Editorial nit, but what is a 'MAN' router.</p> <p>Suggested Remedy:</p> <p>Spell out or define MAN</p> <p>Proposed Response:    Response Status: W</p> <p>PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.</p> <p>It's a typo. It should spell out WAN</p>				
CL: 06	SC: 6.9.3	P: 43	L: 1065	#
<p>Comment Type: T    Comment Status: D    Commenter: Hao Wang</p> <p>Quote from the texts, 'The switching infrastructure builds the backhaul of the network, with terminal Ethernet ports and WLAN access points resembling the nodes of attachment.'</p> <p>As described in the scenario, it is said that the terminals which are directly connecting to a switch should be mapped to NA? Meaning these terminals are part of access network?</p> <p>Figure 27 shows some inconsistency, as the data interfaces from these terminals are marked as R1.</p> <p>Suggested Remedy:</p> <p>An alternative mapping would map these terminals as TE, similar to others, and map the switch ports connecting to the terminals as NA. Other ports would be mapped to BH as usual.</p> <p>In such a case, ports on the switches would have different functions and roles, depending on the context.</p> <p>Proposed Response:    Response Status: W</p> <p>PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.</p> <p>Switches can act both ways concurrently by configuring ports either access port or trunk ports. Switch shown is access device with all ports configured as access ports.</p> <p>Redraw figure 27 with access switch moved partly touching the NA box.</p>				

# IEEE\_P802-1CF\_D1-0 Network Reference Model and Functional Description of IEEE 802 Access Network

CL: 06	SC: 6.9.3	P: 44	L: 1069	#
<p>Comment Type: ER    Comment Status: D    Commenter: Paul Congdon</p> <p>I appreciate the difficulty showing both physical and logical topologies in the same diagram, but this style of 'overlay' figure is cluttered and very hard to read.</p> <p>Suggested Remedy:</p> <p>Perhaps use dashed lines to enclose functions between the virtual and physical world rather than simply overlaying the two figures on one-another. Too cluttered and confusing</p> <p>Proposed Response:    Response Status: W</p> <p>PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.</p> <p>Underlying NRM will be shown in light color to make distinction easier.</p>				
CL: 06	SC: 6.9.3	P: 44	L: 1070	#
<p>Comment Type: E    Comment Status: D    Commenter: Hao Wang</p> <p>R7 interface could be shown in Figure 27.</p> <p>Suggested Remedy:</p> <p>as indicated in the comments</p> <p>Proposed Response:    Response Status: W</p> <p>PROPOSED REJECT.</p> <p>Proposal would lead to overcrowded picture.</p>				
CL: 06	SC: 6.9.3	P: 44	L: 1085	#
<p>Comment Type: E    Comment Status: D    Commenter: Walter Pienciak</p> <p>"many WAN controller do not" is incorrect</p> <p>Suggested Remedy:</p> <p>Change to "Many WAN controllers do not"</p> <p>Proposed Response:    Response Status: W</p> <p>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</p>				
CL: 06	SC: 6.9.3	P: 44	L: 1086	#
<p>Comment Type: TR    Comment Status: X    Commenter: Max Riegel</p> <p>The section 6.9.3 only describes the deployment scenario of a single domain enterprise network. Today, it is usual that enterprises deploy multiple domains to support separation of departments as well as usage of BYOD on the Wi-Fi infrastructure.</p> <p>Suggested Remedy:</p> <p>Adopt amendment proposal on enterprise networks with multiple SSIDs and bridging domains: omniran-18-0003-00-CF00</p> <p>Proposed Response:    Response Status: W</p> <p>Example is accepted for inclusion. Revision requested with different ways to clearly represent VLANs in the figures. Final conclusion will be done based on revised document.</p>				
CL: 06	SC: 6.9.4	P: 45	L: 1108	#
<p>Comment Type: T    Comment Status: D    Commenter: Hao Wang</p> <p>It is a convenient setup for network management entity connecting to a port of switch. But a more common case would setup the network management on the internet, interacting with the WLAN-control deployed in the field.</p> <p>Suggested Remedy:</p> <p>it is an open discussion, no change request is proposed.</p> <p>Proposed Response:    Response Status: W</p> <p>PROPOSED REJECT.</p> <p>No change appropriate.</p>				



# IEEE\_P802-1CF\_D1-0 Network Reference Model and Functional Description of IEEE 802 Access Network

CL: 06	SC: 6.9.4	P: 46	L: 1131	#
<p>Comment Type: E      Comment Status: D      Commenter: Walter Pienciak</p> <p>"not all reference points are such clearly exposed" is awkward</p> <p>Suggested Remedy:</p> <p>Change to "not all reference points are clearly exposed"</p> <p>Proposed Response:      Response Status: W</p> <p>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</p>				
CL: 06	SC: 6.9.5	P: 46	L: 1136	#
<p>Comment Type: TR      Comment Status: X      Commenter: Max Riegel</p> <p>The section 6.9 Deployment scenarios misses any example of an industrial network with potential deployment of TSN functionality.</p> <p>Suggested Remedy:</p> <p>Adopt amendment proposal: omniran-18-0004-00-CF00</p> <p>Proposed Response:      Response Status: W</p> <p>Adoption of additional scenario agreed, however revision of document invited with revised figure following conventions used in other figures mapping to NRM (dotted lines) as well as edits to correct reference to figure and</p>				
CL: 06	SC: 6.9.6	P: 46	L: 1136	#
<p>Comment Type: TR      Comment Status: X      Commenter: Max Riegel</p> <p>The section 6.9 Deployment scenarios misses any example of virtualized access networks as deployed in public broadband access.</p> <p>Suggested Remedy:</p> <p>Adopt amendment proposal: omniran-18-0005-00</p> <p>Proposed Response:      Response Status: W</p> <p>text proposal missing</p>				
CL: 07	SC: 7	P: 47	L: 1157	#
<p>Comment Type: E      Comment Status: D      Commenter: Walter Pienciak</p> <p>The sentence "Usually access networks " is unclear in intent.</p> <p>Suggested Remedy:</p> <p>TG should clarify intent.</p> <p>Proposed Response:      Response Status: W</p> <p>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</p> <p>'Before user data is exchanged, both access networks and terminals usually require the exchange of credentials to establish trust.'</p>				
CL: 07	SC: 7.1.5	P: 53	L: 1378	#
<p>Comment Type: TR      Comment Status: X      Commenter: Max Riegel</p> <p>List of access network setup-specific attributes is incomplete and requires clean-up.</p> <p>Suggested Remedy:</p> <p>Insert in section 7.1.5 a complete list of AN configuration attributes according to the information model provided in section 8.1.2 and revise text of attributes for authorized spectrum access as follows:</p> <p>For the authorized spectrum access in TVWS, there are a few specific information elements:</p> <p>{1} Geolocation: Describes the location of the AN requesting authorization make use of unused TV spectrum</p> <p>{0+} OfferedChannels: List of available channels with maximum allowed EIRP Information provided by the spectrum database for authorized access to TVWS</p> <p>{1+} SpectrumSensingData: Measurement results delivered by the NAs and eventually by the TEs to the ANC for selection of the operating channel.</p> <p>{0+} BackupChannels: List of channelsthat can be used when the operating channel is heavily loaded or must be terminated.</p> <p>Proposed Response:      Response Status: O</p> <p>Accepted in principle. Further input required likely coming out of the completion of the information model in clause 8.1</p>				

# IEEE\_P802-1CF\_D1-0 Network Reference Model and Functional Description of IEEE 802 Access Network

CL: 07	SC: 7.2	P: 59	L: 1544	#
<p>Comment Type: E      Comment Status: D      Commenter: Weiying Cheng</p> <p>Acronyms for NDS?</p> <p>Suggested Remedy:</p> <p>Add acronyms of NDS to Section 4</p> <p>Proposed Response:      Response Status: W</p> <p>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</p>				
CL: 07	SC: 7.2	P: 59	L: 1544	#
<p>Comment Type: T      Comment Status: D      Commenter: Antonio de la Oliva</p> <p>During section 7.2 one is expecting all the time to see the mapping to IEEE 802 techs but there is no reference of it at all. I think there are places of 7.2 where a reference to 7.2.8 would be welcome. For example, when talking about Network Selection, a link to ANQP and then to section 7.2.8 would be good</p> <p>Suggested Remedy:</p> <p>Proposed Response:      Response Status: W</p> <p>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</p> <p>Add statement to the introduction pointing to the mapping to IEEE 802 technologies at the end of the clause.</p>				
CL: 07	SC: 7.2.6.1	P: 64	L: 1702	#
<p>Comment Type: T      Comment Status: D      Commenter: Antonio de la Oliva</p> <p>This section is very focused on wireless, how do you do it in wired terminals? how do you do discovery of vlans for example?</p> <p>Suggested Remedy:</p> <p>Proposed Response:      Response Status: W</p> <p>PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.</p> <p>Add statement to 7.2.6.1 that NA discovery does not apply to 802.3 also empasizing that the rest of the NDS clause would apply.</p>				
CL: 07	SC: 7.2.6.1	P: 64	L: 1704	#
<p>Comment Type: E      Comment Status: D      Commenter: Walter Pienciak</p> <p>"the list of nodes of attachment, which" is incorrect.</p> <p>Suggested Remedy:</p> <p>Change to "the list of nodes of attachment that"</p> <p>Proposed Response:      Response Status: W</p> <p>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</p>				
CL: 07	SC: 7.2.6.4	P: 65	L: 1740	#
<p>Comment Type: E      Comment Status: D      Commenter: Walter Pienciak</p> <p>AR detection does not retrieve access routers, but rather information about access routers.</p> <p>Suggested Remedy:</p> <p>Change to "AR detection is the process of retrieving information about the access routers accessible through "</p> <p>Proposed Response:      Response Status: W</p> <p>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</p>				

# IEEE\_P802-1CF\_D1-0 Network Reference Model and Functional Description of IEEE 802 Access Network

CL: 07	SC: 7.2.8	P: 67	L: 1824	#
Comment Type: E	Comment Status: D	Commenter: Walter Pienciak		
The comma in "AN, to which" is wrong.				
Suggested Remedy:				
Remove the comma.				
Proposed Response:	Response Status: W			
PROPOSED ACCEPT.				
CL: 07	SC: 7.3 and 7.4	P: 68	L: 1863	#
Comment Type: T	Comment Status: D	Commenter: Antonio de la Oliva		
Should not be authentication section before association?				
Suggested Remedy:				
discuss in the meeting				
Proposed Response:	Response Status: W			
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.				
Add statement to 7.3.8 to explain that an 'open authentication' happens in 802.11 before association				
CL: 07	SC: 7.3.7.1	P: 72	L: 2008	#
Comment Type: ER	Comment Status: D	Commenter: Max Riegel		
Caption missing				
Suggested Remedy:				
Add caption "Connection setup"				
Proposed Response:	Response Status: W			
PROPOSED ACCEPT.				
ok, but add as well a reference to the figure in the text.				
CL: 07	SC: 7.3.7.2	P: 72	L: 2013	#
Comment Type: ER	Comment Status: D	Commenter: Max Riegel		
Caption missing				
Suggested Remedy:				
Add caption "Connection teardown by TE"				
Proposed Response:	Response Status: W			
PROPOSED ACCEPT.				
ok, but add as well a reference to the figure in the text.				
CL: 07	SC: 7.3.7.3	P: 72	L: 2020	#
Comment Type: ER	Comment Status: D	Commenter: Max Riegel		
Caption missing				
Suggested Remedy:				
Add caption "Connection teardown by NA"				
Proposed Response:	Response Status: W			
PROPOSED ACCEPT.				
ok, but add as well a reference to the figure in the text.				

# IEEE\_P802-1CF\_D1-0 Network Reference Model and Functional Description of IEEE 802 Access Network

CL: 07	SC: 7.3.7.4	P: 73	L: 2033	#
Comment Type: ER	Comment Status: D	Commenter: Max Riegel		
Caption missing				
Suggested Remedy:				
Add caption "Session relocation through reassociation"				
Proposed Response:	Response Status: W			
PROPOSED ACCEPT.				
ok, but add as well a reference to the figure in the text.				
CL: 07	SC: 7.3.8	P: 73	L: 2044	#
Comment Type: E	Comment Status: D	Commenter: Walter Pienciak		
In this table and others, the text touches the frame.				
Suggested Remedy:				
Adjust spacing.				
Proposed Response:	Response Status: W			
PROPOSED ACCEPT.				
CL: 07	SC: 7.4.2	P: 76	L: 2108	#
Comment Type: E	Comment Status: D	Commenter: Walter Pienciak		
Better phrased as complete sentences throughout section.				
Suggested Remedy:				
Change to, e.g., "User is the entity responsible "				
Proposed Response:	Response Status: W			
PROPOSED ACCEPT.				
CL: 07	SC: 7.5.1.1	P: 81	L: 2274	#
Comment Type: T	Comment Status: D	Commenter: Weiyang Cheng		
This section is more about Ethernet characteristics, not just link characteristics.				
Suggested Remedy:				
Suggest to replace link with Ethernet				
Proposed Response:	Response Status: W			
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.				
'Ethernet' is not really appropriate. Link should be replaced by 'Connectivity'				
CL: 07	SC: 7.5.1.1	P: 81	L: 2282	#
Comment Type: ER	Comment Status: D	Commenter: Jessy Rouyer		
This subclause needlessly introduces new terminology to refer to what appears to essentially be MEF 6.2 Service Types.				
Suggested Remedy:				
Use MEF terminology and reference MEF 6.2.				
Proposed Response:	Response Status: W			
PROPOSED ACCEPT.				

# IEEE\_P802-1CF\_D1-0 Network Reference Model and Functional Description of IEEE 802 Access Network

CL: 07	SC: 7.5.1.1	P: 81	L: 2282	#
<p>Comment Type: E    Comment Status: D    Commenter: Max Riegel</p> <p>Section adopts terminology of MEF, which is exaggerating the scope of this section. Link characteristics is only a small portion of the definition of Ethernet services, and should not adopt terms used for definition of services.</p> <p>Suggested Remedy:</p> <p>Remove throughout section the scheme "E-" to denote link characteristics, i.e. denote it 'Line-characteristic' instead of E-Line (Ethernet-Line) characteristic, 'LAN-characteristic' instead of 'E-Land (Ethernet-LAN) characteristic', and 'Tree- characteristic' instead of 'E-Tree (Ethernet-Tree) characteristic'</p> <p>Proposed Response:    Response Status: W</p> <p>PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.</p> <p>Keep terminology of MEF for architectural concepts and introduce reference to MEF6.2 (only)</p>				
CL: 07	SC: 7.5.1.1	P: 81	L: 2284	#
<p>Comment Type: E    Comment Status: D    Commenter: Max Riegel</p> <p>Figure 42, 43, and 44 show datapath as dotted line; specification consistently uses solid line for datapath</p> <p>Suggested Remedy:</p> <p>Change figures 42, 43, and 44 to show datapath through solid line.</p> <p>Proposed Response:    Response Status: W</p> <p>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</p>				
CL: 07	SC: 7.5.1.1	P: 82	L: 2294	#
<p>Comment Type: E    Comment Status: D    Commenter: Max Riegel</p> <p>Wrong figure title</p> <p>Suggested Remedy:</p> <p>Change title to 'LAN characteristic'</p> <p>Proposed Response:    Response Status: W</p> <p>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</p>				
CL: 07	SC: 7.5.1.1	P: 82	L: 2305	#
<p>Comment Type: E    Comment Status: D    Commenter: Max Riegel</p> <p>Wrong figure title</p> <p>Suggested Remedy:</p> <p>Change title to Tree characteristic'</p> <p>Proposed Response:    Response Status: W</p> <p>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</p>				
CL: 07	SC: 7.5.1.1	P: 82	L: 2313	#
<p>Comment Type: TR    Comment Status: D    Commenter: Glenn Parsons</p> <p>These terms were originated and efined by MEF, they must be acknowledged as such and referenced</p> <p>Suggested Remedy:</p> <p>Attribute origin to MEF and add MEF 6.2 (and MEF 10.3 if appropriate) reference</p> <p>Proposed Response:    Response Status: W</p> <p>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</p> <p>ok, MEF 10.3 is not applicable.</p>				

# IEEE\_P802-1CF\_D1-0 Network Reference Model and Functional Description of IEEE 802 Access Network

CL: 07	SC: 7.5.1.2	P: 83	L: 2319	#
<p>Comment Type: T    Comment Status: D    Commenter: Rodney Cummings</p> <p>802.1Q frame priority is encoded in the Priority Code Point (PCP) field of the VLAN tag (see 802.1Q-2014, 6.9.3). 802.1Q has no "P bits", and the VLAN info is located in a tag and not a distinct header.</p> <p>Suggested Remedy:</p> <p>On line 2319 change "P-bits in the VLAN header" to "Priority Code Point (PCP) field of the VLAN tag". On line 2321 change "P-bit setting" to "PCP field".</p> <p>Proposed Response:    Response Status: W</p> <p>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</p>				
CL: 07	SC: 7.5.1.2	P: 83	L: 2323	#
<p>Comment Type: T    Comment Status: D    Commenter: Rodney Cummings</p> <p>802.1Q does not use the terms "rate constraint traffic" and "time-trigger traffic", so examples might help for the reader to relate these terms to TSN techniques.</p> <p>Suggested Remedy:</p> <p>On line 2323 add the sentence: "An example of RC traffic in IEEE Std 802.1Q is the credit-based traffic shaper, configured using the Stream Reservation Protocol (SRP)." On line 2329 add the sentence "An example of TT traffic in IEEE Std 802.1Q is scheduled traffic."</p> <p>Proposed Response:    Response Status: W</p> <p>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</p>				
CL: 07	SC: 7.5.1.2	P: 83	L: 2358	#
<p>Comment Type: T    Comment Status: D    Commenter: Rodney Cummings</p> <p>There is no "time-aware shaper" in 802.1Q (TSN).</p> <p>Suggested Remedy:</p> <p>Replace "Time-aware shapers are necessary" with "Scheduled traffic is necessary".</p> <p>Proposed Response:    Response Status: W</p> <p>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</p>				
CL: 07	SC: 7.5.3.4	P: 88	L: 2494	#
<p>Comment Type: T    Comment Status: D    Commenter: Antonio de la Oliva</p> <p>Figure 50, I am still missing the fronthaul</p> <p>Suggested Remedy:</p> <p>Add the .1CM part</p> <p>Proposed Response:    Response Status: W</p> <p>PROPOSED REJECT.</p> <p>Fronthaul is out of scope of .1CF.</p>				
CL: 07	SC: 7.5.4	P: 89	L: 2510	#
<p>Comment Type: ER    Comment Status: D    Commenter: Jessy Rouyer</p> <p>"WLAN" surely was meant to be "VLAN".</p> <p>Suggested Remedy:</p> <p>Replace with "VLAN".</p> <p>Proposed Response:    Response Status: W</p> <p>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</p>				

# IEEE\_P802-1CF\_D1-0 Network Reference Model and Functional Description of IEEE 802 Access Network

CL: 07	SC: 7.6.1.1	P: 93	L: 2646	#
Comment Type: E	Comment Status: D	Commenter: Rodney Cummings		
typo				
Suggested Remedy:				
Replace "Resource Reservation Protocol" with "Stream Reservation Protocol".				
Proposed Response:	Response Status: W			
PROPOSED ACCEPT.				
CL: 07	SC: 7.6.1.1	P: 95	L: 2644	#
Comment Type: E	Comment Status: D	Commenter: Walter Pienciak		
Sentence beginning "Part of the IEEE specification" is awkward.				
Suggested Remedy:				
Change to "Included in the IEEE 802 specification"				
Proposed Response:	Response Status: W			
PROPOSED ACCEPT.				
CL: 07	SC: 7.6.1.1	P: 95	L: 2661	#
Comment Type: E	Comment Status: D	Commenter: Walter Pienciak		
"supports 5 different data delivery service" is both grammatically wrong and inconsistent with previous treatment of such numbers.				
Suggested Remedy:				
Change to "supports five different data delivery services" (plural)				
Proposed Response:	Response Status: W			
PROPOSED ACCEPT.				
CL: 07	SC: 7.6.1.2	P: 95	L: 2674	#
Comment Type: E	Comment Status: X	Commenter: Walter Pienciak		
Is it "endstations" or "end-stations" or "end stations"? Varies through document.				
Suggested Remedy:				
Make consistent as per TG consensus.				
Proposed Response:	Response Status: O			
Walter will ask John Messenger to find preferred solution				
CL: 07	SC: 7.6.1.3	P: 96	L: 2689	#
Comment Type: T	Comment Status: D	Commenter: Antonio de la Oliva		
Figure 56, should not the AR include some policy enforcement although out of scope?				
Suggested Remedy:				
Discuss in the meeting				
Proposed Response:	Response Status: W			
PROPOSED REJECT.				
policy enforcement belongs only to NA and BH				

# IEEE\_P802-1CF\_D1-0 Network Reference Model and Functional Description of IEEE 802 Access Network

CL: 07	SC: 7.6.1.4	P: 98	L: 2741	#
<p>Comment Type: TR    Comment Status: D    Commenter: Max Riegel</p> <p>The NRM makes a clear distinction between configuration information stored in NMS and SS, and control procedures performed through ANC. The CNC in the scope of 802.1Qcc has to be spread across NMS and ANC. This is not very clear in the text and figure.</p> <p>Suggested Remedy:</p> <p>Rephrase sentence to "The centralized network configuration is mainly performed in the ANC with configuration information delivered by the NMS." and show distribution of CNC as well in figure 59</p> <p>Proposed Response:    Response Status: W</p> <p>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</p>				
CL: 07	SC: 7.6.1.4	P: 99	L: 2746	#
<p>Comment Type: E    Comment Status: D    Commenter: Walter Pienciak</p> <p>Text is in the wrong font size.</p> <p>Suggested Remedy:</p> <p>Correct the font size.</p> <p>Proposed Response:    Response Status: W</p> <p>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</p>				
CL: 07	SC: 7.6.2.1	P: 99	L: 2755	#
<p>Comment Type: E    Comment Status: D    Commenter: Walter Pienciak</p> <p>Unclear. If it is not the assignment to Service Flows that allows network elements to preferentially process datagrams, but rather the filtering rules that enable that, "allows" should be "allow". Either way, the sentence could be restructured to avoid ambiguity.</p> <p>Suggested Remedy:</p> <p>Rephrase as " by filtering rules, allowing network elements to preferably process "</p> <p>Proposed Response:    Response Status: W</p> <p>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</p>				
CL: 07	SC: 7.6.3.2	P: 100	L: 2792	#
<p>Comment Type: E    Comment Status: D    Commenter: Walter Pienciak</p> <p>"teared down" should be "torn down"</p> <p>Suggested Remedy:</p> <p>replace "teared down" with "torn down"</p> <p>Proposed Response:    Response Status: W</p> <p>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</p>				
CL: 07	SC: 7.6.5.1	P: 101	L: 2831	#
<p>Comment Type: ER    Comment Status: D    Commenter: Max Riegel</p> <p>Line 2831 + 2832 are erroneously idented. SessionKey and DP-ID are not sub-elements of SFConfig</p> <p>Suggested Remedy:</p> <p>Remove identification of lines 2831 + 2832 to bring SessionKey and DP-ID to the same level as SFConfig and ServiceFlow-ID</p> <p>Proposed Response:    Response Status: W</p> <p>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</p>				



# IEEE\_P802-1CF\_D1-0 Network Reference Model and Functional Description of IEEE 802 Access Network

CL: 07	SC: 7.6.7.1	P: 102	L: 2877	#
<p>Comment Type: E    Comment Status: D    Commenter: Walter Pienciak</p> <p>"All entities then reserves and notifies" is incorrect grammatically.</p> <p>Suggested Remedy:</p> <p>Correct sentence.</p> <p>Proposed Response:    Response Status: W</p> <p>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</p>				
CL: 07	SC: 7.6.7.1	P: 102	L: 2881	#
<p>Comment Type: E    Comment Status: D    Commenter: Walter Pienciak</p> <p>"responses" should be "responds"</p> <p>Suggested Remedy:</p> <p>Correct sentence.</p> <p>Proposed Response:    Response Status: W</p> <p>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</p>				
CL: 07	SC: 7.6.7.6	P: 106	L: 2948	#
<p>Comment Type: E    Comment Status: D    Commenter: Walter Pienciak</p> <p>This paragraph is repeated after the section head for 7.6.8.</p> <p>Suggested Remedy:</p> <p>Delete one of the paragraphs.</p> <p>Proposed Response:    Response Status: W</p> <p>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</p> <p>delete lines 2948 - 2952</p>				
CL: 07	SC: 7.7 and 7.8	P: 108	L: 3007	#
<p>Comment Type: T    Comment Status: D    Commenter: Antonio de la Oliva</p> <p>Missing reference model mapping as in previous sections</p> <p>Suggested Remedy:</p> <p>Add</p> <p>Proposed Response:    Response Status: W</p> <p>PROPOSED REJECT.</p> <p>Figures are only used when showing the mapping of functional models, but not for functions introduced in the functional specification.</p>				
CL: 07	SC: 7.7.4	P: 109	L: 3045	#
<p>Comment Type: E    Comment Status: D    Commenter: Walter Pienciak</p> <p>The sentence should use a serial comma for consistency with the rest of the document.</p> <p>Suggested Remedy:</p> <p>Add a comma after "de-duplication"</p> <p>Proposed Response:    Response Status: W</p> <p>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</p>				

# IEEE\_P802-1CF\_D1-0 Network Reference Model and Functional Description of IEEE 802 Access Network

CL: 07	SC: 7.7.5	P: 109	L: 3049	#
<p>Comment Type: TR    Comment Status: X    Commenter: Max Riegel</p> <p>The accounting and monitoring-specific attributes only list usage related attributes, but only few performance related attributes as detailed in section 7.7.8</p> <p>Suggested Remedy:</p> <p>Enhance chapter 7.7.5 with performance related attributes as shown for the various technologies in section 7.7.8</p> <p>Proposed Response:    Response Status: O</p> <p>for further discussion, depends on the conclusion on section 8.1.2</p>				
CL: 07	SC: 7.7.6.2	P: 111	L: 3109	#
<p>Comment Type: E    Comment Status: D    Commenter: Walter Pienciak</p> <p>Sentence should include either "e.g." or "etc." but not both. Either is sufficient to point out the list is not exhaustive.</p> <p>Suggested Remedy:</p> <p>Change text to "and what to collect: network usage    traffic per server/service, etc."</p> <p>Proposed Response:    Response Status: W</p> <p>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</p>				
CL: 07	SC: 7.7.6.3	P: 111	L: 3128	#
<p>Comment Type: E    Comment Status: D    Commenter: Walter Pienciak</p> <p>Paragraph for this and following subfunction descriptions should be indented.</p> <p>Suggested Remedy:</p> <p>Indent paragraphs.</p> <p>Proposed Response:    Response Status: W</p> <p>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</p>				
CL: 07	SC: 7.7.6.3	P: 112	L: 3154	#
<p>Comment Type: E    Comment Status: D    Commenter: Walter Pienciak</p> <p>Sentence is grammatically incorrect.</p> <p>Suggested Remedy:</p> <p>Modify text to either "a common data record" or "a common data record set" or "common data records"</p> <p>Proposed Response:    Response Status: W</p> <p>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</p> <p>ok, 'a common data record'</p>				
CL: 07	SC: 7.7.7	P: 112	L: 3177	#
<p>Comment Type: TR    Comment Status: X    Commenter: Max Riegel</p> <p>Detailed procedures of accounting and monitoring only exposes the procedures used for the collection and transfer of usage related accounting information as in scope of AAA. However, there are additional procedures needed for collection and transfer of performance related information towards NMS.</p> <p>Suggested Remedy:</p> <p>Extend section 7.7.7 with procedures to show the collection and transfer of performance related information to the NMS.</p> <p>Proposed Response:    Response Status: W</p> <p>for further discussion, depends on the conclusion on section 8.1.2</p>				

# IEEE\_P802-1CF\_D1-0 Network Reference Model and Functional Description of IEEE 802 Access Network

CL: 07	SC: 7.8.1	P: 120	L: 3278	#
Comment Type: ER    Comment Status: D    Commenter: Jessy Rouyer 801.1ag-2007 has long been integrated into 802.1Q. Suggested Remedy: Reference appropriates clauses of 802.1Q instead. Proposed Response:    Response Status: W PROPOSED ACCEPT.				
CL: 07	SC: 7.8.3.2	P: 121	L: 3325	#
Comment Type: E    Comment Status: D    Commenter: Max Riegel Section title is too generic. There are many kind of requests from NMS to ANC outside of scope of FDM Suggested Remedy: Rephrase title to 'NMS maintenance requests to ANC' Proposed Response:    Response Status: W PROPOSED ACCEPT.				
CL: 07	SC: 7.8.3.3	P: 121	L: 3341	#
Comment Type: E    Comment Status: D    Commenter: Walter Pienciac "ANC is allowed to do" seems awkward. Suggested Remedy: Change text to "ANC is allowed to include" Proposed Response:    Response Status: W PROPOSED ACCEPT.				
CL: 07	SC: 7.8.5	P: 123	L: 3364	#
Comment Type: T    Comment Status: X    Commenter: Hao Wang Descriptions on 7.8.5 are inconsistent with the information model on 8.1.2.9. Suggested Remedy: Change the texts of 7.8.5 accordingly. Will be provided in a separate contribution. Proposed Response:    Response Status: W Agreed in principle, but requires more input				
CL: 07	SC: 7.8.5	P: 123	L: 3364	#
Comment Type: TR    Comment Status: X    Commenter: Max Riegel FDM-specific attributes only roughly specified without taking attributes into account listed in 7.8.8, and without proper notation of number of occurrency. Suggested Remedy: Extend list of FDM-specific attributes to reflect attributes shown in section 7.8.8 with proper denotation of number of occurrences. Proposed Response:    Response Status: W Dublicate of #36				

# IEEE\_P802-1CF\_D1-0 Network Reference Model and Functional Description of IEEE 802 Access Network

CL: 07	SC: 7.8.7.2	P: 126	L: 3485	#
Comment Type: E	Comment Status: D	Commenter: Max Riegel		
Figure 71 exposes 'TEC' and 'TEI' despite text only mentioning 'TE'. Distinction between TEC and TEI is superfluous and should be avoided.				
Suggested Remedy:				
Rename both, TEI and TEC to 'TE' to align figure to explanatory text.				
Proposed Response:	Response Status: W			
PROPOSED ACCEPT.				
CL: 07	SC: 7.8.8	P: 130	L: 3600	#
Comment Type: ER	Comment Status: D	Commenter: Pat Thaler		
"The following table" is not the correct way to reference a table.				
Suggested Remedy:				
Put in a reference to the table which when clicked brings one to the table				
Proposed Response:	Response Status: W			
PROPOSED ACCEPT.				
CL: 07	SC: 7.8.8	P: 131	L: 3605	#
Comment Type: E	Comment Status: D	Commenter: Pat Thaler		
The landscape tables are undesirable because they make the PDF display as narrower than window width when using fit to page window. Also, even though they are wide, there are lots of carriage returns in the entries and some attributes in Table 10 are wrapped with a hyphen. Also, the column widths of the tables are wonky rather than evenly spaced (e.g. wide for 802.22 in table 10 and much narrower for 802.1ag and 802.11. In table 9, one of the IEEE 802.3 entries goes out of its block. Also applies to Table 8				
Suggested Remedy:				
Use a different format. It isn't clear that there is a benefit to displaying all the entries in a one page window format. Consider a subclause per technology type or not doing all the specs on one page width				
Proposed Response:	Response Status: W			
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.				
Table will be divided into 3 tables, each sub-table rotated by 90° with technologies stacked on each other. Hao will create proposal to verify that approach makes sense.				
CL: 07	SC: 7.8.8	P: 131	L: 3605	#
Comment Type: TR	Comment Status: D	Commenter: Weiying Cheng		
Spanning Tree is not defined in 802.1ag-2007, it is defined in 802.1Q-2014. Also, 802.1ag-2007 is not part of 802.1Q				
Suggested Remedy:				
Change 802.1ag-2007 to 802.1Q-2014				
Proposed Response:	Response Status: W			
PROPOSED ACCEPT.				
CL: 08	SC: 8.1	P: 134	L: 3625	#
Comment Type: TR	Comment Status: X	Commenter: Max Riegel		
Information model is divided between service model and configuration and maintenance model. Combination of configuration and maintenance model creates overly complex structure and leads to less useful results.				
Suggested Remedy:				
Access network information model should be structured into operation, administration, and maintenance parts. The operational part is already roughly covered by the service information model, but the infrastructure configuration and maintenance model should be separated into an infrastructure configuration model (administration) and a fault diagnostic (maintenance) model.				
Proposed Response:	Response Status: W			
Agreed in principle, but requires more input				

# IEEE\_P802-1CF\_D1-0 Network Reference Model and Functional Description of IEEE 802 Access Network

CL: 08	SC: 8.1.1	P: 135	L: 3648	#
Comment Type: E    Comment Status: D    Commenter: Weiying Cheng Did not see any reason to have Figure 75 here Suggested Remedy: Remove Figure 75 Proposed Response:    Response Status: W PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Figure makes sense, but rationale requires explanation. Add sentence with figure reference.				
CL: 08	SC: 8.1.1.1	P: 136	L: 3654	#
Comment Type: TR    Comment Status: D    Commenter: Pat Thaler The text is not searchable in any of the figures that I checked. This is especially problematic for users of the standard in the service information model figures where a reader may want to search for an element. Also, the font size in the information model figures looks very small. It looks like it is less than the 6 point minimum that the IEEE style manual sets for figures. Also there is some distortion/blurring from how the figures were imported. Suggested Remedy: All figure text should have searchable text in at least 6 point font size. The text should be clearly rendered. Proposed Response:    Response Status: W PROPOSED ACCEPT.				
CL: 08	SC: 8.1.2.5	P: 144	L: 3717	#
Comment Type: E    Comment Status: D    Commenter: Walter Pienciak "need" should be "needs" Suggested Remedy: Replace "need" with "needs" Proposed Response:    Response Status: W PROPOSED ACCEPT.				
CL: 08	SC: 8.1.2.8	P: 146	L: 3731	#
Comment Type: T    Comment Status: X    Commenter: Hao Wang Information described in Figure 92 is not consistent with 7.7.5 accounting attributes. Suggested Remedy: Change Figure 85, 92, 94, accordingly. Will be provided in a separate contribution. Proposed Response:    Response Status: W further input needed				
CL: 08	SC: 8.1.2.9	P: 147	L: 3735	#
Comment Type: E    Comment Status: D    Commenter: Weiying Cheng Acronyms for FDM? Suggested Remedy: Add acronyms of FDM to Section 4 Proposed Response:    Response Status: W PROPOSED ACCEPT.				

# IEEE\_P802-1CF\_D1-0 Network Reference Model and Functional Description of IEEE 802 Access Network

CL: 08	SC: 8.2.1.3	P: 150	L: 3802	#
Comment Type: E	Comment Status: D	Commenter: Walter Pienciak		
Should there be a comma after "CIS"?				
Suggested Remedy:				
Add comma after "CIS"				
Proposed Response:	Response Status: W			
PROPOSED ACCEPT.				
CL: 08	SC: 8.2.4.2	P: 153	L: 3900	#
Comment Type: E	Comment Status: D	Commenter: Walter Pienciak		
Either the first case "Access network " should not be italicized or the second case "Orchestrator initiated" should be.				
Suggested Remedy:				
Make consistent.				
Proposed Response:	Response Status: W			
PROPOSED ACCEPT.				
no italic				
CL: 08	SC: 8.2.4.2	P: 153	L: 3906	#
Comment Type: E	Comment Status: D	Commenter: Walter Pienciak		
Should "and ANC" be "ANC"?				
Suggested Remedy:				
Change "and ANC" to "ANC"				
Proposed Response:	Response Status: W			
PROPOSED ACCEPT.				
CL: 08	SC: 8.3.1	P: 156	L: 3958	#
Comment Type: ER	Comment Status: X	Commenter: Jessy Rouyer		
The sentence on this line sounds like marketing that need not belong in an 802.1 standard. Likewise at line 3963 "that enables innovation" sounds more like marketing than technical content. Clause 8 of the standard appears as it could use rewording to avoid such marketing tone, for example lines 4004-4005, 4008. Also at line 4005, IEEE 802.1 is not currently working on 802.1Qay. Furthermore 802.1Qay is used but no reference is provided for it.				
Suggested Remedy:				
Remove marketing wording in section 8. Actualize the content. The text should be uniform across the draft standard. Make sure all documents mentioned in the document are referenced either normatively or in the bibliography.				
Proposed Response:	Response Status: O			
Antonio will clean up text in 8.3 to fit the normative text style of the main body of an IEEE standard.				
CL: 08	SC: 8.3.1.1	P: 158	L: 4008	#
Comment Type: E	Comment Status: D	Commenter: Walter Pienciak		
Should "several works" be "several efforts"?				
Suggested Remedy:				
Change "several works" to "several efforts"				
Proposed Response:	Response Status: W			
PROPOSED ACCEPT.				

# IEEE\_P802-1CF\_D1-0 Network Reference Model and Functional Description of IEEE 802 Access Network

CL: 08	SC: 8.3.1.2	P: 158	L: 4049	#
Comment Type: E    Comment Status: D    Commenter: Walter Pienciak "An special" should be "A special" Suggested Remedy: Change "An special" to "A special" Proposed Response:    Response Status: W PROPOSED ACCEPT.				
CL: 08	SC: 8.3.4.2	P: 162	L: 4188	#
Comment Type: E    Comment Status: D    Commenter: Walter Pienciak This sentence includes the only use of "PoA" in the document and it is not defined/expanded. Suggested Remedy: Define PoA somewhere. Proposed Response:    Response Status: W PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Replace 'network PoA' to NA				
CL: 08	SC: 8.3.5.1	P: 165	L: 4331	#
Comment Type: E    Comment Status: D    Commenter: Walter Pienciak "LIST" should be normal case in this and following lists. Suggested Remedy: Change "LIST" to "List" Proposed Response:    Response Status: W PROPOSED ACCEPT.				
CL: 08	SC: 8.4	P: 168	L: 4407	#
Comment Type: T    Comment Status: X    Commenter: Antonio de la Oliva I think we should reference some of the ETSI NFV documents and provide the reference architecture, even simplified for the NFV model Suggested Remedy: Discuss in the meeting Proposed Response:    Response Status: W for further discussion				