

#1 Type: E TF: TF3 Clause: 7.1.3.5 Page: 34 Line: 26 Commenter: Jouni Korhonen / Broadcom Ltd.
 Comment Status: Resolved Response Status: Accept Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: -

Intendations of the sub-clause is wrong.

Just fix the intendation.

Agreed

#2 Type: TR TF: TF3 Clause: 7.1 Page: 33 Line: 18 Commenter: Jouni Korhonen / Broadcom Ltd.
 Comment Status: Withdraw Response Status: None Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: -

The structure agnostic mapper should also cover 64b66b coding, not just 8b10b.

"8b10b / 64b66b aware mode removes the line coding bits such as for CPRI encoded with 8b10b or 64b66b." etc

We were only going to do 8b10b - because the 64b66b benefit is so small. New baseline proposal needed. // Need to discuss FEC too // ***** Comment withdrawn on 2016.08.23, at 06:32

#3 Type: TR TF: TF3 Clause: 7.1 Page: 33 Line: 18 Commenter: Jouni Korhonen / Broadcom Ltd.
 Comment Status: Resolved Response Status: Accept Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: -

There is no mention of scrambling. When scrambling is supported it should also be undone while decoding 8b10b/64b66b.

As part of the decoding 8b10b or 64b66b the scrambling (when supported) shall also be undone.

Add text 'As part of the decoding the scrambling (when supported) shall also be undone.'

#4 Type: E TF: TF3 Clause: 4.2.3 Page: 22 Line: 6 Commenter: Jouni Korhonen / Broadcom Ltd.
 Comment Status: Resolved Response Status: Accept Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: -

"Accept changes" went wrong with the sub-clause topic.

-

Problem in PDF version/conversion. Need to check conversion next time.

#5 Type: E TF: TF3 Clause: 4.2.4 Page: 22 Line: 9 Commenter: Jouni Korhonen / Broadcom Ltd.
 Comment Status: Resolved Response Status: Accept Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: -

"Accept changes" went wrong with the sub-clause topic.

-

Problem in PDF version/conversion. Need to check conversion next time.

#6 Type: E TF: TF3 Clause: 3.4 Page: 16 Line: 21 Commenter: Jouni Korhonen / Broadcom Ltd.
 Comment Status: Resolved Response Status: Accept Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: -

In Table 3-1 EtherType has unnecessary "("

Remove "("

OK

#7 Type: E TF: TF3 Clause: 4.1 Page: 18 Line: 10 Commenter: Jouni Korhonen / Broadcom Ltd.
 Comment Status: Resolved Response Status: Accept Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: -

Reference errors - "Error! Reference source not found"

Remove stale references.

Yes. Don't know why this keeps happening!

#8 Type: E TF: TF3 Clause: 4.1 Page: 18 Line: 12 Commenter: Jouni Korhonen / Broadcom Ltd.
 Comment Status: Resolved Response Status: Accept Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: -

Reference errors - "Error! Reference source not found"

Remove stale references.

Yes. Don't know why this keeps happening!

#9 Type: E TF: TF3 Clause: 4.1.2 Page: 20 Line: 10 Commenter: Jouni Korhonen / Broadcom Ltd.
 Comment Status: Resolved Response Status: Accept Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: -

List numbering is wrong (conversion errors and same letter repeating.

Redo the list numbering.

Problem in PDF version/conversion. Need to check conversion next time.

#10 Type: ER TF: TF3 Clause: 4.1.2 Page: 20 Line: 16 Commenter: Jouni Korhonen / Broadcom Ltd.
 Comment Status: Resolved Response Status: Accept Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: -

Minimum effective BER number is wrong.

Should be using superscript for "-12".

Yes

#11 Type: E TF: TF3 Clause: 4.4.1 Page: 23 Line: 5 Commenter: Jouni Korhonen / Broadcom Ltd.
 Comment Status: Resolved Response Status: Accept Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: -

"Table 3-1Table 4-1."

Remove the extra table reference.

Yes

#12 Type: E TF: TF3 Clause: 4.4.4.1 Page: 24 Line: 24 Commenter: Jouni Korhonen / Broadcom Ltd.
 Comment Status: Resolved Response Status: Accept Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: -

Full stops and commas are in bold.

Undo the bold formatting.

MS word is doing something very strange with the paragraph - keeps changing the formatting. I'll just re-write it again.

#13 Type: TR TF: TF3 Clause: 6.8 Page: 30 Line: 8 Commenter: Jouni Korhonen / Broadcom Ltd.
 Comment Status: Withdraw Response Status: None Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: -

".8b10stripMode" needs to be expanded to cover also 64b66b coding. See comment #3 as well.

Rename the parameter to ".stripMode" and allocate two bits for it: 00b=tunneling, 01b=8b10b, 10b=64b66, 11b=reserved.

We were only going to do 8b10b - because the 64b66b benefit is so small. New baseline proposal needed. ***** Comment withdrawn on 2016.08.23, at 06:31

#14 Type: TR TF: TF3 Clause: 6.9 Page: 31 Line: 13 Commenter: Jouni Korhonen / Broadcom Ltd.
 Comment Status: Withdraw Response Status: None Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: -

".8b10stripMode" needs to be expanded to cover also 64b66b coding. See comments #3 and #14 as well.

Rename the parameter to ".stripMode" and allocate two bits for it: 00b=tunneling, 01b=8b10b, 10b=64b66, 11b=reserved.

We were only going to do 8b10b - because the 64b66b benefit is so small. New baseline proposal needed. ***** Comment withdrawn on 2016.08.23, at 06:31

#15 Type: ER TF: TF3 Clause: 7.2.7 Page: 40 Line: 1 Commenter: Jouni Korhonen / Broadcom Ltd.
 Comment Status: Resolved Response Status: Accept Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: -

List numbering is wrong (conversion errors and same letter repeating).

Redo the list numbering.

Problem in PDF version/conversion. Need to check conversion next time.

#16 Type: E TF: TF3 Clause: 8 Page: 44 Line: 1 Commenter: Jouni Korhonen / Broadcom Ltd.
 Comment Status: Resolved Response Status: Accept Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: -

Clause and sub-clause numbering has "accept changes" caused errors i.e., old numbering is still visible.

-

Problem in PDF version/conversion. Need to check conversion next time.

#17 Type: TR TF: TF3 Clause: 8.1.8.2 Page: 46 Line: 6 Commenter: Jouni Korhonen / Broadcom Ltd.
 Comment Status: Resolved Response Status: Accept Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: -

The support for the timing control packet should be optional, since the current timeStamp format already offers similar functionality inband.

Add a sentence "The support of timing packet is optional."

ok

#18 Type: TR TF: TF3 Clause: 8.1.8.2 Page: 46 Line: 9 Commenter: Jouni Korhonen / Broadcom Ltd.
 Comment Status: Resolved Response Status: Accept Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: -

There is no description how the "orderInfo" is used in this packet and whether it is in timeStamp or sequence number mode.

Add text along lines "The orderInfo shall contain a sequence numner and can used to detect lost packets."

Add text "The .orderInfo field shall contain a sequence number"

#19 Type: E TF: TF3 Clause: Annex A Page: 50 Line: 3 Commenter: Jouni Korhonen / Broadcom Ltd.

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

List numbering is wrong (conversion errors and same letter repeating).

Redo the list numbering.

Problem in PDF version/conversion. Need to check conversion next time.

#20 Type: TR TF: TF3 Clause: Annex B Page: 52 Line: 1 Commenter: Jouni Korhonen / Broadcom Ltd.

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

The algorithm does not take "Accepted Time Window" into account and therefore is wrong what is defined e.g., in sub-clause 6.8.

Correct the example algorithm: `#define WINMSKFULL 0x000000ffffffffULL // 24 bit ns, 16 bit sub-ns #define VALIDWIN 0x000000dffffffffULL // valid to +14ms, late -2ms #define P2WSHFT (16-6) // Time expressed in units of nanoseconds and mult`

Thanks for the update

#21 Type: ER TF: TF3 Clause: - Page: 7 Line: - Commenter: Lu Yang / CAICT

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

Wrong page number from this page. Page 7 is missing. note: in this comments file, all the page number is referred to the number shown by the pdf reader software, rather than the page shown at the foot of the page.

Correct the page number from this page on.

Weird. Thanks.

#22 Type: T TF: TF3 Clause: 3.1 Page: 14 Line: 8 Commenter: Lu Yang / CAICT

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

CRAN is never used in the document. If we agree to only use C-RAN everywhere, we can remove the terminology CRAN.

Remove CRAN.

OK

#23 Type: T TF: TF3 Clause: 3.1 Page: 14 Line: 11 Commenter: Lu Yang / CAICT

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

LCC should be LCc with the second 'c' a subscript.

Change per the comment. Also apply to LCD and LCT.

OK

#24 Type: T TF: TF3 Clause: 3.1 Page: 14 Line: 16 Commenter: Lu Yang / CAICT
Comment Status: Resolved Response Status: Accept Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: -

OAM should be interpreted as: operations, administration, and maintenance

Change per the comment.

OK

#25 Type: T TF: TF3 Clause: 3.1 Page: 15 Line: 4 Commenter: Lu Yang / CAICT
Comment Status: Resolved Response Status: Accept Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: -

WDM should be interpreted as: wavelength division multiplexing

Change per the comment.

OK

#26 Type: E TF: TF3 Clause: 3.5 Page: 16 Line: 8 Commenter: Lu Yang / CAICT
Comment Status: Resolved Response Status: Accept Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: -

For a Hexadecimal number, a-f and A-F are used interchangeably throughout the document. Suggest to align the usage.

Capitalize all the letters in a Hex value throughout the document.

OK

#27 Type: E TF: TF3 Clause: 4.1 Page: 17 Line: 10 Commenter: Lu Yang / CAICT
Comment Status: Resolved Response Status: Accept Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: -

Reference is missing.

Make sure all the cross-references alive.

OK

#28 Type: E TF: TF3 Clause: 4.1.2 Page: 19 Line: 10 Commenter: Lu Yang / CAICT
Comment Status: Resolved Response Status: Accept Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: -

Wrong numbering of listed itmes.

Fix the wrong numbering.

Problem in PDF version/conversion. Need to check conversion next time.

#29 Type: T TF: TF3 Clause: 4.1.2 Page: 19 Line: 16 Commenter: Lu Yang / CAICT
Comment Status: Resolved Response Status: Accept Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: -

-12 should be a superscript.

Chane per the comment.

OK

#30 Type: ER TF: TF3 Clause: 1.1 Page: 12 Line: 12 Commenter: Richard Tse / Microsemi
Comment Status: Resolved Response Status: Accept Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: -

"a clock distribution mechanism" does not concisely describe the needs of RoE. It could be misinterpreted as just "a frequency distribution mechanism"

change to "a phase and frequency distribution mechanism"

OK

#31 Type: TR TF: TF3 Clause: 1.2 Page: 12 Line: 20 Commenter: Richard Tse / Microsemi
Comment Status: Resolved Response Status: Accept Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: -

The structure agnostic mechanism is not guaranteed to be "bit transparent" when the line coding is terminated. The original 8B/10B running disparity, the 64B/66B scrambler alignment, and the bit errors of CPRI may not be maintained.

change to "Transport a C-RAN Radio Fronthaul protocol such as CPRI in a bit-transparent or a semi-transparent manner (structure agnostic) over Ethernet"

OK

#32 Type: ER TF: TF3 Clause: 2 Page: 13 Line: 2 Commenter: Richard Tse / Microsemi
Comment Status: Resolved Response Status: Accept Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: -

typo "aplication"

change to "application"

ok

#33 Type: ER TF: TF3 Clause: 2 Page: 13 Line: 6 Commenter: Richard Tse / Microsemi
Comment Status: Resolved Response Status: Accept Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: -

typo "Sprcification"

change to "Specification"

ok

#34 Type: E TF: TF3 Clause: 2 Page: 13 Line: - Commenter: Richard Tse / Microsemi
Comment Status: Resolved Response Status: Accept Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: -

Perhaps IEEE 802.3 should be added to this list

Add IEEE 802.3, perhaps with a specific reference to the clause that describes the frame format. If 802.3 is not added in this normative list, it should at least be added to the Bibliography list.

ok. Will add to bibliography for now. In addition, move lines 8-17 from 1.1 Scope to 1 Overview

#35 Type: ER TF: TF3 Clause: 3.1 Page: 14 Line: 9 Commenter: Richard Tse / Microsemi
Comment Status: Resolved Response Status: Accept Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: -

I/Q acronym is on same line as FDD acronym

move the I/Q acronym to its own line

ok

#36 Type: ER TF: TF3 Clause: 3.1 Page: 14 Line: 24 Commenter: Richard Tse / Microsemi
Comment Status: Resolved Response Status: Accept Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: -

Isn't TDD just "Time Division Duplex", without the "I/Q"?

Remove "I/Q" from this acronym

ok

#37 Type: ER TF: TF3 Clause: 3.5 Page: 15 Line: 24 Commenter: Richard Tse / Microsemi
Comment Status: Resolved Response Status: Accept Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: -

"Figure 3 2 Figure 3 2 illustrates the" needs to be fixed.

Remove the extra "Figure 3.2"

ok

#38 Type: ER TF: TF3 Clause: 3.5 Page: 16 Line: 3 Commenter: Richard Tse / Microsemi
Comment Status: Resolved Response Status: Accept Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: -

"I,Q" should be "I/Q"

change "I,Q" to "I/Q" I also see that "IQ" is used in other places. We should pick one term and use it consistently throughout the document. Do a global search and replace.

ok

#39 Type: ER TF: TF3 Clause: 4.1.2 Page: 19 Line: 15 Commenter: Richard Tse / Microsemi
Comment Status: Resolved Response Status: Accept Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: -

Remove the phrase "if there is no other means for end points for clock sync". Even if other (and better) means are available for frequency and phase sync (e.g GNSS), it is usually desirable for the network to provide this function, at least, as a backup.

Remove the phrase "if there is no other means for end points for clock sync".

ok

#40 Type: ER TF: TF3 Clause: 4.2.1 Page: 20 Line: 13 Commenter: Richard Tse / Microsemi

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

For the last sentence "Ethernet links are assumed to be bi-directional, however, only one direction may be used", do you mean that it is allowed to use either just one direction or both directions? Or do you mean that only one direction is allowed? I be

Change sentence to "Ethernet links are assumed to be bi-directional, however, it is also allowed for just one direction to be used."

ok

#41 Type: ER TF: TF3 Clause: 4.2.2 Page: 20 Line: 20 Commenter: Richard Tse / Microsemi

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

I don't understand what the text within the brackets "the control process is the responsible of rewriting the flowID in the RoE control packet header with a proper value other than the NIL flowID when required" means.

Fix the text in within the brackets.

4.2.2 will just say 'Control data is fed to a block known as the "control process" in this specification , See 4.2.4' In 4.2.4 we add something along the lines - 'When the .flowID is set to NIL flowID, the control process shall set the flowID in th

#42 Type: ER TF: TF3 Clause: 4.2.3 Page: 21 Line: 8 Commenter: Richard Tse / Microsemi

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

For the last sentence "CPRI ports are assumed to be bi-directional, however, only one direction may be used", do you mean that it is allowed to use either just one direction or both directions? Or do you mean that only one direction is allowed? I believ

Change sentence to "CPRI ports are assumed to be bi-directional, however, it is also allowed for just one direction to be used."

ok

#43 Type: ER TF: TF3 Clause: 4.4.1 Page: 22 Line: 8 Commenter: Richard Tse / Microsemi

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

This sentence has two references listed back to back: "This document reserves sub types listed in Table 3 1Table 4 1"

Remove "Table 3.1" from the sentence.

ok

#44 Type: TR TF: TF3 Clause: 4.4.3 Page: 23 Line: 7 Commenter: Richard Tse / Microsemi

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

The last sentence should be state that the count of octets following the common frame format header does not include the 4 Ethernet FCS bytes.

Change to "... follow a scheme similar to IPv6 and include a length field where the value of the length is the total number of octets following the common frame format header, not including the Ethernet FCS bytes."

Change from '... follow a scheme similar to IPv6 and include a length field where the value of the length is the total number of octets following the common frame format header.' to "... follow a scheme similar to IPv6 and include a lengt

#45 Type: ER TF: TF3 Clause: 4.4.4.1 Page: 24 Line: 1 Commenter: Richard Tse / Microsemi

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

In Table 4-3, the description of .seqNumPMax has ".seqNumPMax < 1 << 32-p". What does this mean? I read this as ".seqNumPMax is less than 1 which is much-less-than 32-p", which doesn't make sense.

Describe this better.

Change from "Maximum numerical value of the p-counter field so that .seqNumPMax < 1 << 32-p." to "Maximum numerical value of the p-counter field so that .seqNumPMax is less than $2^{(32-p)}$ "

#46 Type: ER TF: TF3 Clause: 4.4.4.1 Page: 24 Line: 1 Commenter: Richard Tse / Microsemi

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

IN Table 4-3, the description of .seqNumQMax has ".seqNumQMax < 1 << p-1". What does this mean? I read this as ".seqNumPMax is less than 1 which is much-less-than p-1", which doesn't make sense.

Describe this better.

Comment is not accurate, the definition is not ".seqNumQMax < 1 << p-1" However, we feel "Maximum numerical value of the q-counter field so that .seqNumQMax < 1 << p-q." Should say "... .seqNumQMax is less than $2^{(p-q)}$ "

#47 Type: ER TF: TF3 Clause: 4.4.4.1 Page: 24 Line: 1 Commenter: Richard Tse / Microsemi

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

The value of .seqNumPInc should be referenced in the description of .seqNumPIncProp.

For .seqNumPIncProp, change the 2nd bullet to "0x1 increments by the constant .seqNumPInc on every sent packet."

ok

#48 Type: ER TF: TF3 Clause: 4.4.4.1 Page: 24 Line: 1 Commenter: Richard Tse / Microsemi

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

The value of .seqNumQInc should be referenced in the description of .seqNumQIncProp.

For .seqNumQIncProp, change the 2nd bullet to "0x1 increments by the constant .seqNumQInc on every .seqNumPVal counter wrap event."

ok

#49 Type: TR TF: TF3 Clause: 4.4.4 Page: 25 Line: 7 Commenter: Richard Tse / Microsemi

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

The value 16,777,216ns is wrong. 0xFFFFF is equal to 16,777,215ns.

Change "16,777,216ns" to "16,777,215ns".

yes

#50 Type: TR TF: TF3 Clause: 4.4.4 Page: 25 Line: 12 Commenter: Richard Tse / Microsemi
 Comment Status: Resolved Response Status: Accept Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: -

"16,777,216.96875ns" should be "16,777,215.96875ns".

Change "16,777,216.96875ns" to "16,777,215.96875ns".

yes

#51 Type: ER TF: TF3 Clause: 8.1.7 Page: 45 Line: 5 Commenter: Richard Tse / Microsemi
 Comment Status: Resolved Response Status: Accept Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: -

Clarify the term "payload" to avoid possible confusion between "payload" and "TLV information string", which could be viewed as the payload of a TLV.

Change "The payload contains one or multiple TLVs" to "The payload field contains one or multiple TLVs".

yes

#52 Type: TR TF: TF3 Clause: 6.9 Page: 29 Line: 1 Commenter: Richard Tse / Microsemi
 Comment Status: Resolved Response Status: AIP Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: -

The speed of a CPRI link cannot be given in Mbps using integer numbers (e.g. CPRI option 3 = 4 x 614.4Mbps = 2457.6Mbps).

Change the "Link speed" parameter into a "CPRI bit rate option" parameter. This will tell what rate the CPRI link is running at, what line encoding it is using, and, likely, some other useful information. Since there are currently only 10 CPRI rates def

Expressed in Mbps as IEEE-754 double precision floating point number. Add IEEE-754 as a normative reference.

#53 Type: TR TF: TF3 Clause: 6.10 Page: 29 Line: 14 Commenter: Richard Tse / Microsemi
 Comment Status: Withdraw Response Status: None Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: -

64B66B aware mode is missing from this list of mapper parameters

A "64b66b aware mode" should be added (similar to 8b10b aware mode) to address CPRI options 8 to 10.

We were only going to do 8b10b - because the 64b66b benefit is so small. New baseline proposal needed. ***** Comment withdrawn on 2016.08.23, at 06:31

#54 Type: TR TF: TF3 Clause: 6.10 Page: 20 Line: 14 Commenter: Richard Tse / Microsemi
 Comment Status: Resolved Response Status: AIP Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: -

Why does the Mapper need to know the Accepted Time Window? Isn't this just used by the Demapper? If the Mapper uses this value to generate an appropriate presentation time, then it would also need to know the max latency of other components in the data p

Remove Accepted Time Window

Add 'The use of Accepted Time Window in the mapper is used for error checking only.'

#55 Type: TR TF: TF3 Clause: 6.11 Page: 31 Line: 2 Commenter: Richard Tse / Microsemi
 Comment Status: Withdraw Response Status: None Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: -

64B66B aware mode is missing from this list of mapper parameters

A "64b66b aware mode" should be added (similar to 8b10b aware mode) to address CPRI options 8 to 10.

I was under the impression we were only going to do 8b10b - because the 64b66b benefit is so small. ***** Comment withdrawn on 2016.08.23, at 06:56

#56 Type: ER TF: TF3 Clause: 7 Page: 33 Line: 4 Commenter: Richard Tse / Microsemi
 Comment Status: Resolved Response Status: Accept Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: -

There is a grammatical error in "If the encoding and packing method of source of the IQ stream is unknown, the required parameters for more efficient mappers are unknown and a simple tunneling mapper is the only possible mapper to use."

Change "...method of source..." to "...method of the source..."

ok

#57 Type: ER TF: TF3 Clause: 7.1 Page: 33 Line: 11 Commenter: Richard Tse / Microsemi
 Comment Status: Resolved Response Status: Accept Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: -

The sentence "While data may be CPRI data streams, the data could be any binary constant rate data stream within the range of data rates supported by that equipment" is a bit awkward.

Change to "While the constant bit rate data stream is commonly encoded with the CPRI protocol, it could also be of any other protocol as long as it is within the range of rates supported by the equipment"

ok

#58 Type: ER TF: TF3 Clause: 7.1 Page: 33 Line: 19 Commenter: Richard Tse / Microsemi
 Comment Status: Withdraw Response Status: None Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: -

The second mode of operation only describes an 8b10b example. It should describe the mapping more generically and give examples for 8b10b and 64b66b CPRI.

Change this paragraph to: "Line encoding is removed and the original unencoded data is tunneled by the mapper. For example, an 8b10b aware mapper for CPRI options 1 to 7 removes the 10b line encoding and the resulting 8-bit octets are tunneled by the ma

We were only going to do 8b10b - because the 64b66b benefit is so small. New baseline proposal needed. ***** Comment withdrawn on 2016.08.23, at 06:31

#59 Type: ER TF: TF3 Clause: 7.1.1 Page: 34 Line: 1 Commenter: Richard Tse / Microsemi
 Comment Status: Resolved Response Status: AIP Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: -

in this paragraph, are you just talking about the p counter? Do you need to say something about the q counter too?

clarify the use of the p and q counters

Explicitly mention that this is the p-counter and that the q-counter is not used. Mention .StripMode. Only p-counter is used.

#60 Type: ER TF: TF3 Clause: 7.1.3.2 Page: 34 Line: 15 Commenter: Richard Tse / Microsemi
 Comment Status: Resolved Response Status: AIP Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: -

This second paragraph seems to define the same items as the previous paragraph, but with different values. What is the difference between the two paragraphs in this clause?

Fix one of these two paragraphs. Is it defining something different than the other paragraph?

Yes, we should merge these. Change from 'For packets being sent from the RoE node, the flowID field is populated with the .mapperID which sources this packet (flowID=.mapperID). For packets being received by the RoE node, the flowID field is populated

#61 Type: ER TF: TF3 Clause: 7.1.3.3 Page: 34 Line: 18 Commenter: Richard Tse / Microsemi
 Comment Status: Resolved Response Status: AIP Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: -

Clause 7.1.3.3 should be combined with clause 7.1.1. Both talk about the same thing.

To keep the headings based on the fields of an RoE packet, it is probably better to move the text from clause 7.1.1 into clause 7.1.3.3.

Ok. Will merge 7.1.1 into 7.1.3.3

#62 Type: ER TF: TF3 Clause: 7.3.5 Page: 43 Line: 7 Commenter: Richard Tse / Microsemi
 Comment Status: Resolved Response Status: Accept Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: -

there are two successive bullets that use "a)"

Change the bullet on this line to "b)"

Problem in PDF version/conversion. Need to check conversion next time.

#63 Type: ER TF: TF3 Clause: 8 Page: 44 Line: 3 Commenter: Richard Tse / Microsemi
 Comment Status: Resolved Response Status: Accept Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: -

"Figure 8-1" is repeated twice in succession in this line.

Delete the second "Figure 8-1"

yes

#64 Type: TR TF: TF3 Clause: 8.1.8.2 Page: 46 Line: 3 Commenter: Richard Tse / Microsemi
 Comment Status: Withdraw Response Status: None Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: -

I don't think we need the Timing Control packet anymore. We resolved this problem with the timestamp in the data packets.

Delete this clause.

Some folks want to use this method. Mention it is optional (See comment 17) ***** Comment withdrawn on 2016.08.23, at 06:22

#65 Type: ER TF: TF3 Clause: Bibliography Page: 54 Line: 7 Commenter: Richard Tse / Microsemi

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

802.1TSN isn't a standard on its own. It is a taskforce that defines standards related to time sensitive networks. So, it should not be put into a bibliography in this manner. If any standard from IEEE 802.1TSN other than IEEE 802.1CM is relevant to IEE

Remove IEEE 802.1TSN from the Bibliography

ok

#66 Type: E TF: TF3 Clause: Bibliography Page: 54 Line: - Commenter: Richard Tse / Microsemi

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

ITU-T G.8275.1 and G.8275.2 are the most prevalent standards that address how frequency and phase can be distributed across a telecommunications network.

add ITU-T G.8275.1 and ITU-T G.8275.2 to the bibliography

ok

#67 Type: ER TF: TF3 Clause: 7.2.1 Page: 35 Line: 12 Commenter: Richard Tse / Microsemi

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

In this sentence, "Note that the .lenSkip bits are only affective when extracting/storing data from/to some other source than RoE payload field such as the CPRI basic frame", the selection of "storing data to some other source than RoE payload field such

Change "affective" to "valid". Split the extracting/storing, from/to selections into 2 sentences so each can be better specified.

ok

#68 Type: ER TF: TF3 Clause: 7.2.2.5 Page: 36 Line: 18 Commenter: Richard Tse / Microsemi

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

Is there something special about the yellow octets in this diagram. Why do they not have I and Q values inside of them. To associate the yellow octets from the subsequent figure (which do have I and Q values) correspond to this figure, I suggest you add

Add the I and Q values into the yellow boxes of this figure.

ok.