IEEE 1904.4 Nx25G-EPON MGMT, D0.2, Received Comments (all comments)

Printed on 3/29/2021 at 1:24:53 PM

2 Type: ER TF: TF4 Clause: 0 Page: 0 Line: 0 Commenter: Marek Hajduczenia / Charter
omment Status: New Response Status: None Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: -
ne numbers are missing
dd line numbers into the draft
1 Type: E TF: TF4 Clause: 3.6 Page: 43 Line: 0 Commenter: Marek Hajduczenia / Charter
omment Status: New Response Status: None Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: -
Package] is the designation of the given package," - does not make sense anymore, since we do not have packages to work with.
emove this line and references to [Package] in this block of text. Remove "A" in the names of all PICS entries (no more package names) Rewrite "For example, CU-LPTK3a epresents a PICS entry for an ONU compliant with Package C for the "optical link protection, trunk type" feature, item 3, subitem a)." to read "For example, U-LPTK3a epresents a PICS entry for an ONU for the "optical link protection, trunk type" feature, item 3, subitem a)." to read "For example, U-LPTK3a
4 Type: E TF: TF4 Clause: 4.2 Page: 46 Line: 0 Commenter: Marek Hajduczenia / Charter
omment Status: New Response Status: None Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: -
able 4-1 is messed up some. Column "A" should likely be renamed to IEEE Std 1904.4? And then there are missing entries for some the features, for example MCC, DCQ, PM
LD, RPC, EDP - I think these ought to be just removed from this table with no impact on draft content.
er comment
3 Type: E TF: TF4 Clause: 4.2 Page: 46 Line: 0 Commenter: Marek Hajduczenia / Charter
omment Status: New Response Status: None Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: -
here are still plenty of references to SIEPON in the draft. We need to replace it with something newer to avoid confusion with 1904.1 definition
do not have a good proposal, apart from slapping 25G at the end of SIEPON, making it into SIEPON-25G or something like this to designate it as something new. Alternative
ould be SIEPON-CA to indicate coverage of .3ca. There are 34 hits in the document, some of them embedded in names of promitives, for example subclause 9.3.5.1.4 and EPON_Event_TLV.Type
Type: TR TF: TF4 Clause: 4.4 Page: 47 Line: 0 Commenter: Marek Haiduczenia / Charter
6 Type: TR TF: TF4 Clause: 4.4 Page: 47 Line: 0 Commenter: Marek Hajduczenia / Charter omment Status: New Response Status: None Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: -
omment Status: New Response Status: None Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: - able 4-2 lists 0x58-D0-8F as OUI_1904_4. Since it also used in 1904.1 as Package C OUI, I am not sure whether it is OK to name it as such, or just indicate it is shared with
omment Status: New Response Status: None Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: - able 4-2 lists 0x58-D0-8F as OUI_1904_4. Since it also used in 1904.1 as Package C OUI, I am not sure whether it is OK to name it as such, or just indicate it is shared with ackge A defined in 1904.1. I feel like some extra explanatory text might be needed in here to explain this overlap and make sure people are not confused.
omment Status: New Response Status: None Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: - able 4-2 lists 0x58-D0-8F as OUI_1904_4. Since it also used in 1904.1 as Package C OUI, I am not sure whether it is OK to name it as such, or just indicate it is shared with
omment Status: New Response Status: None Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: - able 4-2 lists 0x58-D0-8F as OUI_1904_4. Since it also used in 1904.1 as Package C OUI, I am not sure whether it is OK to name it as such, or just indicate it is shared with ackge A defined in 1904.1. I feel like some extra explanatory text might be needed in here to explain this overlap and make sure people are not confused.
omment Status: New Response Status: None Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: - able 4-2 lists 0x58-D0-8F as OUI_1904_4. Since it also used in 1904.1 as Package C OUI, I am not sure whether it is OK to name it as such, or just indicate it is shared with ackge A defined in 1904.1. I feel like some extra explanatory text might be needed in here to explain this overlap and make sure people are not confused.
omment Status: New Response Status: None Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: - able 4-2 lists 0x58-D0-8F as OUI_1904_4. Since it also used in 1904.1 as Package C OUI, I am not sure whether it is OK to name it as such, or just indicate it is shared with ackge A defined in 1904.1. I feel like some extra explanatory text might be needed in here to explain this overlap and make sure people are not confused. dd the following text at the end of first para in 4.4: "Note that the OUI value is shared with Package A defined in IEEE Std 1904.1."
omment Status: New Response Status: None Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: - able 4-2 lists 0x58-D0-8F as OUI_1904_4. Since it also used in 1904.1 as Package C OUI, I am not sure whether it is OK to name it as such, or just indicate it is shared with ackge A defined in 1904.1. I feel like some extra explanatory text might be needed in here to explain this overlap and make sure people are not confused. dd the following text at the end of first para in 4.4: "Note that the OUI value is shared with Package A defined in IEEE Std 1904.1." 7 Type: TR TF: TF4 Clause: 5.1 Page: 48 Line: 0 Commenter: Marek Hajduczenia / Charter
omment Status: New Response Status: None Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: - able 4-2 lists 0x58-D0-8F as OUI_1904_4. Since it also used in 1904.1 as Package C OUI, I am not sure whether it is OK to name it as such, or just indicate it is shared with ackge A defined in 1904.1. I feel like some extra explanatory text might be needed in here to explain this overlap and make sure people are not confused. dd the following text at the end of first para in 4.4: "Note that the OUI value is shared with Package A defined in IEEE Std 1904.1." 7 Type: TR TF: TF4 Clause: 5.1 Page: 48 Line: 0 Commenter: Marek Hajduczenia / Charter comment Status: New Response Status: None Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: - he second para in 5.1 points to BBF TR-200 and MEF 10.2. While MEF is still valid, no issues there, I am somewhat wondering whether TR-200 is still applicable in our case. TR-200 is still applicable, we might simply reference to Annex 5A in IEEE Std 1904.1, rather than having this material copied. If TR-200 is not applicable, we will have much
omment Status: New Response Status: None Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: - able 4-2 lists 0x58-D0-8F as OUI_1904_4. Since it also used in 1904.1 as Package C OUI, I am not sure whether it is OK to name it as such, or just indicate it is shared with ackge A defined in 1904.1. I feel like some extra explanatory text might be needed in here to explain this overlap and make sure people are not confused. dd the following text at the end of first para in 4.4: "Note that the OUI value is shared with Package A defined in IEEE Std 1904.1." 7 Type: TR TF: TF4 Clause: 5.1 Page: 48 Line: 0 Commenter: Marek Hajduczenia / Charter comment Status: New Response Status: None Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: - he second para in 5.1 points to BBF TR-200 and MEF 10.2. While MEF is still valid, no issues there, I am somewhat wondering whether TR-200 is still applicable in our case.
omment Status: New Response Status: None Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: - able 4-2 lists 0x58-D0-8F as OUI_1904_4. Since it also used in 1904.1 as Package C OUI, I am not sure whether it is OK to name it as such, or just indicate it is shared with ackge A defined in 1904.1. I feel like some extra explanatory text might be needed in here to explain this overlap and make sure people are not confused. dd the following text at the end of first para in 4.4: "Note that the OUI value is shared with Package A defined in IEEE Std 1904.1." 7 Type: TR TF: TF4 Clause: 5.1 Page: 48 Line: 0 Commenter: Marek Hajduczenia / Charter comment Status: New Response Status: None Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: - he second para in 5.1 points to BBF TR-200 and MEF 10.2. While MEF is still valid, no issues there, I am somewhat wondering whether TR-200 is still applicable in our case. TR-200 is still applicable, we might simply reference to Annex 5A in IEEE Std 1904.1, rather than having this material copied. If TR-200 is not applicable, we will have much
omment Status: New Response Status: None Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: - able 4-2 lists 0x58-D0-8F as OUI_1904_4. Since it also used in 1904.1 as Package C OUI, I am not sure whether it is OK to name it as such, or just indicate it is shared with ackge A defined in 1904.1. I feel like some extra explanatory text might be needed in here to explain this overlap and make sure people are not confused. dd the following text at the end of first para in 4.4: "Note that the OUI value is shared with Package A defined in IEEE Std 1904.1." 7 Type: TR TF: TF4 Clause: 5.1 Page: 48 Line: 0 Commenter: Marek Hajduczenia / Charter comment Status: New Response Status: None Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: - he second para in 5.1 points to BBF TR-200 and MEF 10.2. While MEF is still valid, no issues there, I am somewhat wondering whether TR-200 is still applicable in our case. TR-200 is still applicable, we might simply reference to Annex 5A in IEEE Std 1904.1, rather than having this material copied. If TR-200 is not applicable, we will have much
omment Status: New Response Status: None Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: - able 4-2 lists 0x58-D0-8F as OUI_1904_4. Since it also used in 1904.1 as Package C OUI, I am not sure whether it is OK to name it as such, or just indicate it is shared with ackge A defined in 1904.1. I feel like some extra explanatory text might be needed in here to explain this overlap and make sure people are not confused. dd the following text at the end of first para in 4.4: "Note that the OUI value is shared with Package A defined in IEEE Std 1904.1." 7 Type: TR TF: TF4 Clause: 5.1 Page: 48 Line: 0 Commenter: Marek Hajduczenia / Charter 7 Type: TR TF: TF4 Clause: 5.1 Page: 48 Line: 0 Commenter: Marek Hajduczenia / Charter 7 the second para in 5.1 points to BBF TR-200 and MEF 10.2. While MEF is still valid, no issues there, I am somewhat wondering whether TR-200 is still applicable in our case. 7 TR-200 is still applicable, we might simply reference to Annex 5A in IEEE Std 1904.1, rather than having this material copied. If TR-200 is not applicable, we will have much eaneup to do, removing references to TR-200 and common terminology.
omment Status: New Response Status: None Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: - able 4-2 lists 0x58-D0-8F as OUI_1904_4. Since it also used in 1904.1 as Package C OUI, I am not sure whether it is OK to name it as such, or just indicate it is shared with ackge A defined in 1904.1. I feel like some extra explanatory text might be needed in here to explain this overlap and make sure people are not confused. dd the following text at the end of first para in 4.4: "Note that the OUI value is shared with Package A defined in IEEE Std 1904.1." 7 Type: TR TF: TF4 Clause: 5.1 Page: 48 Line: 0 Commenter: Marek Hajduczenia / Charter comment Status: New Response Status: None Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: - he second para in 5.1 points to BBF TR-200 and MEF 10.2. While MEF is still valid, no issues there, I am somewhat wondering whether TR-200 is still applicable in our case. TR-200 is still applicable, we might simply reference to Annex 5A in IEEE Std 1904.1, rather than having this material copied. If TR-200 is not applicable, we will have much eaneup to do, removing references to TR-200 and common terminology. 9 Type: TR TF: TF4 Clause: 5.3.2 Page: 49 Line: 0 Commenter: Marek Hajduczenia / Charter
omment Status: New Response Status: None Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: - able 4-2 lists 0x58-D0-8F as OUI_1904_4. Since it also used in 1904.1 as Package C OUI, I am not sure whether it is OK to name it as such, or just indicate it is shared with ackge A defined in 1904.1. I feel like some extra explanatory text might be needed in here to explain this overlap and make sure people are not confused. dd the following text at the end of first para in 4.4: "Note that the OUI value is shared with Package A defined in IEEE Std 1904.1." 7 Type: TR TF: TF4 Clause: 5.1 Page: 48 Line: 0 Commenter: Marek Hajduczenia / Charter comment Status: New Response Status: None Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: - he second para in 5.1 points to BBF TR-200 and MEF 10.2. While MEF is still valid, no issues there, I am somewhat wondering whether TR-200 is still applicable in our case. TR-200 is still applicable, we might simply reference to Annex 5A in IEEE Std 1904.1, rather than having this material copied. If TR-200 is not applicable, we will have much eaneup to do, removing references to TR-200 and common terminology. 9 Type: TR TF: TF4 Clause: 5.3.2 Page: 49 Line: 0 Commenter: Marek Hajduczenia / Charter comment Status: New Response Status: None Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: -
Domment Status: New Response Status: None Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: - able 4-2 lists 0x58-D0-8F as OUI_1904_4. Since it also used in 1904.1 as Package C OUI, I am not sure whether it is OK to name it as such, or just indicate it is shared with ackge A defined in 1904.1. I feel like some extra explanatory text might be needed in here to explain this overlap and make sure people are not confused. dd the following text at the end of first para in 4.4: "Note that the OUI value is shared with Package A defined in IEEE Std 1904.1." 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 1 6 6 7 7 7 7 7 7 7
Domment Status: New Response Status: None Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: - able 4-2 lists 0x58-D0-8F as OUI_1904_4. Since it also used in 1904.1 as Package C OUI, I am not sure whether it is OK to name it as such, or just indicate it is shared with ackge A defined in 1904.1. I feel like some extra explanatory text might be needed in here to explain this overlap and make sure people are not confused. dd the following text at the end of first para in 4.4: "Note that the OUI value is shared with Package A defined in IEEE Std 1904.1." 7 Type: TR TF: TF4 Clause: 5.1 Page: 48 Line: 0 Commenter: Marek Hajduczenia / Charter 0 mment Status: New Response Status: None Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: - he second para in 5.1 points to BBF TR-200 and MEF 10.2. While MEF is still valid, no issues there, I am somewhat wondering whether TR-200 is still applicable in our case. TR-200 is still applicable, we might simply reference to Annex 5A in IEEE Std 1904.1, rather than having this material copied. If TR-200 is not applicable, we will have much eaneup to do, removing references to TR-200 and common terminology. 9 Type: TR TF: TF4 Clause: 5.3.2 Page: 49 Line: 0 Commenter: Marek Hajduczenia / Charter 0 Type: TR TF: TF4 Clause: 5.3.2 Page: 49 Line: 0 Commenter: Marek Hajduczenia / Charter 0 Type: TR </td
Domment Status: New Response Status: None Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: - able 4-2 lists 0x58-D0-8F as OUI_1904_4. Since it also used in 1904.1 as Package C OUI, 1 am not sure whether it is OK to name it as such, or just indicate it is shared with ackge A defined in 1904.1. I feel like some extra explanatory text might be needed in here to explain this overlap and make sure people are not confused. dd the following text at the end of first para in 4.4: "Note that the OUI value is shared with Package A defined in IEEE Std 1904.1." 7 Type: TR TF: TF4 Clause: 5.1 Page: 48 Line: 0 Commenter: Marek Hajduczenia / Charter 0 moment Status: New Response Status: None Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: - he second para in 5.1 points to BBF TR-200 and MEF 10.2. While MEF is still valid, no issues there, I am somewhat wondering whether TR-200 is still applicable in our case. TR-200 is still applicable, we might simply reference to Annex 5A in IEEE Std 1904.1, rather than having this material copied. If TR-200 is not applicable, we will have much eaneup to do, removing references to TR-200 and common terminology. 9 Type: TR TF: TF4 Clause: 5.3.2 Page: 49 Line: 0 Commenter: Marek Hajduczenia / Charter 0 Type: TR TF: TF4 Clause: 5.3.2 Page: 49 Line: 0 Commenter: EPON and Clause 75 for 10G-EPON, - this is 1G/10G-EPON specified in IEEE Std 802.3, Clau
Domment Status: New Response Status: None Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: - able 4-2 lists 0x58-D0-8F as OUI_1904_4. Since it also used in 1904.1 as Package C OUI, I am not sure whether it is OK to name it as such, or just indicate it is shared with ackge A defined in 1904.1. I feel like some extra explanatory text might be needed in here to explain this overlap and make sure people are not confused. dd the following text at the end of first para in 4.4: "Note that the OUI value is shared with Package A defined in IEEE Std 1904.1." 7 Type: TR TF: TF4 Clause: 5.1 Page: 48 Line: 0 Commenter: Marek Hajduczenia / Charter 0 mment Status: New Response Status: None Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: - TR-200 is still applicable, we might simply reference to Annex SA in IEEE Std 1904.1, rather than having this material copied. If TR-200 is not applicable, we will have much eaneup to do, removing references to TR-200 and MEF 10.2. While MEF is still ap04.1, rather than having this material copied. If TR-200 is not applicable, we will have much eaneup to do, removing references to TR-200 and common terminology. 0 Type: TR TF: TF4 Clause: 5.3.2 Page: 49 Line: 0 Commenter: Marek Hajduczenia / Charter 0 Type: TR TF: TF4 Clause: 5.3.2 Page: 49 Line: 0 Commenter: Marek Hajduczenia / Charter 0 Type: TR TF: TF4
omment Status: New Response Status: None Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: - able 4-2 lists 0x58-Do-8F as OUI_1904_4. Since it also used in 1904.1 as Package C OUI, I am not sure whether it is OK to name it as such, or just indicate it is shared with ackge A defined in 1904.1. I feel like some extra explanatory text might be needed in here to explain this overlap and make sure people are not confused. dd the following text at the end of first para in 4.4: "Note that the OUI value is shared with Package A defined in 1904.1." 7 Type: TR TF: TF4 Clause: 5.1 Page: 48 Line: 0 Commenter: Marek Hajduczenia / Charter comment Status: New Response Status: None Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: - he second para in 5.1 points to BBF TR-200 and MEF 10.2. While MEF is still valid, no issues there, I am somewhat wondering whether TR-200 is still applicable in our case. TR-200 is still applicable, we might simply reference to Annex 5A in IEEE Std 1904.1, rather than having this material copied. If TR-200 is not applicable, we will have much eaneup to do, removing references to TR-200 and common terminology. 9 Type: TR TF: TF4 Clause: 5.3.2 Page: 49 Line: 0 Commenter: Marek Hajduczenia / Charter comment Status: New Response Status: None Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: - tetailed technical requirements for the ODN used in EPON are specified in IEEE Std 802.3, Clause 60 for 1G-EPON and Clause 75 for 10G-EPON this is 1G/10G-EPON specific hange to "Detailed technical requirements for the ODN used in EPON are specified in IEEE Std 802.3, Clause 60 for 1G-EPON and Clause 75 for 10G-EPON this is 1G/10G-EPON and IG-EPON in the 3.3.3 to "Nx25G-EPON" in Aso change "IG-EPON and 10G-EPON" in 5.3.3 to "Nx25G-EPON" in the date whet he ere of the top be proceed acordingly. Punt to editore in text to fix the accordingly. Punt to editor to fix the accordingly. Punt to editor to fix the accordingly. Punt to editore in the date with the date of the top proceed accordingly. Punt to editore in the date with fixed with a fig
Domment Status: New Response Status: None Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: - able 4-2 lists 0x58-D0-8F as OUI_1904_4. Since it also used in 1904.1 as Package C OUI, I am not sure whether it is OK to name it as such, or just indicate it is shared with ackge A defined in 1904.1. I feel like some extra explanatory text might be needed in here to explain this overlap and make sure people are not confused. dd the following text at the end of first para in 4.4: "Note that the OUI value is shared with Package A defined in IEEE Std 1904.1." 7 Type: TR TF: TF4 Clause: 5.1 Page: 48 Line: 0 Commenter: Marek Hajduczenia / Charter 0 mment Status: New Response Status: None Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: - TR-200 is still applicable, we might simply reference to Annex SA in IEEE Std 1904.1, rather than having this material copied. If TR-200 is not applicable, we will have much eaneup to do, removing references to TR-200 and MEF 10.2. While MEF is still ap04.1, rather than having this material copied. If TR-200 is not applicable, we will have much eaneup to do, removing references to TR-200 and common terminology. 0 Type: TR TF: TF4 Clause: 5.3.2 Page: 49 Line: 0 Commenter: Marek Hajduczenia / Charter 0 Type: TR TF: TF4 Clause: 5.3.2 Page: 49 Line: 0 Commenter: Marek Hajduczenia / Charter 0 Type: TR TF: TF4

#10 Type: TR	TF: TF4 Clause: 5.3.4.1	Page: 53 Line: 0 Commenter: Marek Hajduczenia / Charter	
Comment Status: New	Response Status: None	Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: -	
Figure 5-5 and other stack figures show "RS" and we have "MCRS" in Nx25G-EPON.			
Replace "RS" with "MCR	S" and any expansions, as need	ded.	
-			
#15 Type: TR	TF: TF4 Clause: 6	Page: 58 Line: 0 Commenter: Marek Hajduczenia / Charter	
Comment Status: New	Response Status: None	Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: -	
Whole section 6 - with s down by close to 28 pag	0	ue block description - the rest of the text could be just referenced from IEEE Std 1904.1, and that would skinny the draft	
per comment			
-			

IEEE 1904.4 Nx25G-EPON MGMT, D0.2, Received Comments (all comments)

#11 Type: TR TF: TF4 Clause: 6.2.13 Page: 61 Line: 0 Commenter: Marek Hajduczenia / Charter			
Comment Status: New Response Status: None Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: -			
"For the [Q] block, each functional" is not correct anymore in Nx25G-EPON, since we do not have thresholds anymore. Text needs to be marked for review via editorial note Similar comment needs to be added in 6.5.6 and 8.4, which covers queue defintions and is peppered with threshold references. Figures 8-2 and Figure 8-3 will need to be removed altogether, since these are not supported anymore in Nx25G-EPON PICS 4A.2.3 and 4A.3.3 will also need to be revied since they cover REPORT MPCPDU format and that is not correct anymore			
Per comment			
-			
#12 Type: TR TF: TF4 Clause: 7 Page: 86 Line: 0 Commenter: Marek Hajduczenia / Charter			
Comment Status: New Response Status: None Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: -			
The whole section 7.2, 7.3 is not speed specific, so it could be refereced as a whole from 1904.1, rather than creating one more copy of this text - that would skinny the draft			
down quite some (close to 50 pages)			
Consider referencing content of 7.2 and 7.3 from IEEE Std 1904.1, rather than copying verbatim for no good reason.			
-			
#13 Type: TR TF: TF4 Clause: 7.4.1 Page: 134 Line: 0 Commenter: Marek Hajduczenia / Charter			
Comment Status: New Response Status: None Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: -			
The following items should be removed from the list since they are no longer covered or supported for Nx25G-EPON: Dulticast based on combined VLAN and group address with no authorization control (see 7.4.4) Dulticast based on combined LLID and IP group address (see 7.4.2)			
per comment			
-			
#14 Type: TR TF: TF4 Clause: 7.4.1.1.1 Page: 136 Line: 0 Commenter: Marek Hajduczenia / Charter			
Comment Status: New Response Status: None Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: -			
All the text covering multicast implementations is 1/10G-EPON specific, starting from words "Generally, to achieve multicast connectivity in EPON "			
This next needs to be marked for review, given that the multicast delivery in Nx25G-EPON is different from previous EPON generations. Section 7.4.1.1.2 might need to be removed altogether, since it is not really applicable anymore?			
-			
#5 Type: T TF: TF4 Clause: 9 Page: 161 Line: 0 Commenter: Marek Hajduczenia / Charter			
Comment Status: New Response Status: None Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: -			
Some features listed in "Clause 9 specifically addresses functions and requirements related to device and transceiver monitoring, definitions of associated alarms and warnings, optical link protection, and remote ONU transmitter power supply control." are not supported for 1904.4			
Change the text to read "Clause 9 specifically addresses functions and requirements related to device and transceiver monitoring, definitions of associated alarms and warnings, and optical link protection."			

Page 2 of 2