

#2 Type: ER TF: TF4 Clause: 0 Page: 0 Line: 0 Commenter: Marek Hajduczenia / Charter

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

Line numbers are missing

Add line numbers into the draft

-

#1 Type: E TF: TF4 Clause: 3.6 Page: 43 Line: 0 Commenter: Marek Hajduczenia / Charter

Comment Status: Proposed Response Status: Accept 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.

Remove 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 represents 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 represents a PICS entry for an ONU for the "optical link protection, trunk type" feature, item 3, subitem a)."

-

#3 Type: E TF: TF4 Clause: 4.2 Page: 46 Line: 0 Commenter: Marek Hajduczenia / Charter

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

There 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

I 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 would be SIEPON-CA to indicate coverage of .3ca. There are 34 hits in the document, some of them embedded in names of primitives, for example subclause 9.3.5.1.4 and SIEPON_Event_TLV.Type

No specific remedy at this time.

#4 Type: E TF: TF4 Clause: 4.2 Page: 46 Line: 0 Commenter: Marek Hajduczenia / Charter

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

Table 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, PLD, RPC, EDP - I think these ought to be just removed from this table with no impact on draft content.

Per comment

-

#6 Type: TR TF: TF4 Clause: 4.4 Page: 47 Line: 0 Commenter: Marek Hajduczenia / Charter

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

Table 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 Package 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.

Add 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: Proposed Response Status: AIP Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: -

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.

If 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 cleanup to do, removing references to TR-200 and common terminology.

I do not believe TR-200 has 25/50G-EPON in scope, so likely a cleanup is needed. Editorial note for this time around to have a more complete proposal for next draft version.

#9 Type: TR TF: TF4 Clause: 5.3.2 Page: 49 Line: 0 Commenter: Marek Hajduczenia / Charter

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

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 specific

Change to "Detailed technical requirements for the ODN used in EPON are specified in IEEE Std 802.3ca-2020, Clause 142.". Similar change is needed in 5.3.5.1 Similarly, change "1G-EPON or 10G-EPON" in 5.3.3 to "Nx25G-EPON". Also change "1G-EPON and 10G-EPON" (single instance) to "Nx25G-EPON" There are in total 62 instances of 1G-EPON and 58 instances of 10G-EPON in the draft which need to be processed accordingly. Punt to editor to fix them accordingly.

-

#8 Type: ER TF: TF4 Clause: 5.3.1 Page: 49 Line: 0 Commenter: Marek Hajduczenia / Charter

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

Figure 5-1 needs to update scope from 1904.1 to 1904.4, both locations

per comment

-

#10 Type: TR TF: TF4 Clause: 5.3.4.1 Page: 53 Line: 0 Commenter: Marek Hajduczenia / Charter

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

Figure 5-5 and other stack figures show "RS" and we have "MCRS" in Nx25G-EPON.

Replace "RS" with "MCRS" and any expansions, as needed.

-

#15 Type: TR TF: TF4 Clause: 6 Page: 58 Line: 0 Commenter: Marek Hajduczenia / Charter

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

Whole section 6 - with small changes to 6.5.6 and Queue block description - the rest of the text could be just referenced from IEEE Std 1904.1, and that would skinny the draft down by close to 28 pages.

per comment

Put editorial note indicating material reference from 1904.1 might be appropriate. For now, leave the material as it is.

#11 Type: TR TF: TF4 Clause: 6.2.13 Page: 61 Line: 0 Commenter: Marek Hajduczenia / Charter
 Comment Status: Proposed Response Status: AIP 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 definitions 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 revised since they cover REPORT MPCPDU format and
 that is not correct anymore

Per comment

Put editorial note indicating material reference from 1904.1 might be appropriate. For now, leave the material as it is.

#12 Type: TR TF: TF4 Clause: 7 Page: 86 Line: 0 Commenter: Marek Hajduczenia / Charter
 Comment Status: Proposed Response Status: AIP Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: -

The whole section 7.2, 7.3 is not speed specific, so it could be referenced 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.

Put editorial note indicating material reference from 1904.1 might be appropriate. For now, leave the material as it is.

#13 Type: TR TF: TF4 Clause: 7.4.1 Page: 134 Line: 0 Commenter: Marek Hajduczenia / Charter
 Comment Status: Proposed Response Status: Accept Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: -

The following items should be removed from the list since they are no longer covered or supported for Nx25G-EPON: Multicast based on combined VLAN and group address
 with no authorization control (see 7.4.3) Multicast based on combined VLAN and group address with authorization control (see 7.4.4) Multicast 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: Proposed Response Status: AIP 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 text 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?

Put editorial note indicating material reference from 1904.1 might be appropriate. For now, leave the material as it is.

#5 Type: T TF: TF4 Clause: 9 Page: 161 Line: 0 Commenter: Marek Hajduczenia / Charter
 Comment Status: Proposed Response Status: Accept 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."

-

#16 Type: T TF: TF4 Clause: 14.4.1.1.1 Page: 242 Line: 1 Commenter: Glen Kramer / Broadcom
 Comment Status: Proposed Response Status: Accept Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: -

Action item #15. ONU are unaware if any specific LLID is assigned to other ONUs or not. Therefore ONUs don't know if an LLID is unicast or multicast. Combine LLID and mLLID
 into one ObjectType.

Implement change as shown in tf4_2104_kramer_1.pdf

-

#17 Type: T TF: TF4 Clause: 14.4.3.1.2 Page: 272 Line: 1 Commenter: Glen Kramer / Broadcom
 Comment Status: Proposed Response Status: Accept Commenter Satisfaction: None Category: -

Action item #17. Per 802.3ca, the ONU only has (needs) one MAC address. Discuss if there are any use cases for the ONU to have multiple MAC addresses. If not, update the
 attribute as proposed.

Implement change as shown in tf4_2104_kramer_2.pdf

-