| #wg-1-16 Type: E | TF: WG | Clause: 0 | Page: 0 | Line: - | Commenter: Glen Kramer / Broadcom |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

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

Draft under WG ballot shall include line numbers

Add line numbers

-

| #wg-1-1 Type: E | TF: WG | Clause: 2 | Page: 5 | Line: - | Commenter: Marek Hajduczenia / Bright House Networks |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

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

"IEEE Std 802.3™-2012, IEEE Standard for Ethernet." is not valid anymore. 2015 version was approved and will be published by the time we are done with IEEE Std 1904.1-2016

Change "IEEE Std 802.3™-2012, IEEE Standard for Ethernet." to "IEEE Std 802.3™-2015, IEEE Standard for Ethernet."

-

| #wg-1-2 Type: E | TF: WG | Clause: 2 | Page: 5 | Line: - | Commenter: Marek Hajduczenia / Bright House Networks |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

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

Reference to 802.3-2008 seems a bit odd right now, that we have 2012 and 2015 editions of 802.3 standard.

Change "IEEE Std 802.3ah™-2004, Amendment to IEEE Std 802.3™-2003: Media Access Control Parameters, Physical Layers, and Management Parameters for Subscriber Access Networks, now part of IEEE Std 802.3™-2008." to "IEEE Std 802.3ah™-2004, Amendment to IEEE Std 802.3™-2003: Media Access Control Parameters, Physical Layers, and Management Parameters for Subscriber Access Networks, now part of IEEE Std 802.3™.", i.e., remove date from the reference to 802.3

-

| #wg-1-3 Type: E | TF: WG | Clause: 2 | Page: 5 | Line: - | Commenter: Marek Hajduczenia / Bright House Networks |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

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

802.3av is also part of 802.3 published standard, yet information is missing

Change "IEEE Std 802.3av™-2009, Amendment 1 to IEEE Std 802.3™-2008: Physical Layer Specifications and Management Parameters for 10 Gb/s Passive Optical Networks." to "IEEE Std 802.3av™-2009, Amendment 1 to IEEE Std 802.3™-2008: Physical Layer Specifications and Management Parameters for 10 Gb/s Passive Optical Networks, now part of IEEE Std 802.3™."

-

| #wg-1-36 Type: T | TF: WG | Clause: 6.5.2.1.1 | Page: 50 | Line: - | Commenter: Glen Kramer / Broadcom |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

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

At the beginning of this section, we separate Port and LLID from other "true" L2 fields. But then we list LINK_INDEX in Table 6-1 together with all the L2 fields. PORT_INDEX and LLID_VALUE are not listed anywhere in the table.

Renumber Table 6-1 into 6-2 and insert a new table 6-1 titled "L1 classification fields" as shown in rmtf_1512_kramer_L1_fields_1.pdf.

Verify correct updates for all cross-references pointing to tables in Clause 6.

In table 14-225, change "For definitions of individual fields, see Table 6-1." to "For definitions of individual fields, see 6.5.2.1.1."

Per comment but also on page 50, change

1) Call table 6-1 "Topology-related paramters"
2) In table 6-1, change all "This fields" and "This field" to "This parameter"
3) Change "... recognize the following fields:" to "... recognize the following fields/parameters:"
4) Also change:
Port (by index)
b) LLID (by index or value)
c) L2 Fields (see Table 6-1)
d) L3 Fields (see Table 6-2)
e) L4 Fields (see Table 6-3)
To:
a) Topology-related parameters (Port by index, LLID by index or value - see Table 6-1)
b) L2 Fields (see Table 6-2)
c) L3 Fields (see Table 6-3)
d) L4 Fields (see Table 6-4)

| #wg-1-9 Type: E | TF: WG | Clause: 6.5.2.1.1 | Page: 82 | Line: - | Commenter: Curtis Knittle / CableLabs |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

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

a' should be 'an'

Change "Index of a LLID within the given ONU" to "Index of an LLID within the given ONU"

-

| #wg-1-14 Type: E | TF: WG | Clause: 7.2.2.3.1 | Page: 99 | Line: - | Commenter: Glen Kramer / Broadcom |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

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

The draft contains 10 cross-references to Table 7-40. None of these links are live.

Fix cross-references to Table 7-40 - make them live.

-

#wg-1-17 Type: TR    TF: WG    Clause: 7.2.2.3.1    Page: 99    Line: -    Commenter: Glen Kramer / Broadcom

Comment Status: Resolved    Response Status: Accept    Commenter Satisfaction: Yes    Category: -

In D2.0, Package A, tables for multicast rules for the OLT and ONU were separated. But the references in Tables 7-24, 7-25, 7-26, 7-28, 7-29, and 7-30 say "The rules for multicast filtering are specified in Table 7-40 for OLT and ONU…"

Replace the text:
"The rules for multicast filtering are specified in Table 7-40 for OLT and ONU for the multicast forwarding based on LLID and IP multicast address."
With the following text:
"The rules for multicast filtering and forwarding based on LLID and IP multicast address are specified in Table 7-40 for the OLT and in Table 7-41 for the ONU."

-

#wg-1-4  Type: T    TF: WG    Clause: 7.4.5.2.1    Page: 139    Line: -    Commenter: Marek Hajduczenia / Bright House Networks

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

"These IGMP/MLD control frames are not tagged" - it seems to be redundant, given that the forwarding is based on rules configured by the OLT. These rules would identify the frame, and also actions need to be performed by the ONU, i.e., whether to add, rewrite, or strip any tags.

Strike "These IGMP/MLD control frames are not tagged" or replace to read "These IGMP/MLD control frames are typically not tagged when leaving the UNI"

Strike "These IGMP/MLD control frames are not tagged"

#wg-1-27 Type: TR    TF: WG    Clause: 7.4.5    Page: 139    Line: -    Commenter: Glen Kramer / Broadcom

Comment Status: Resolved    Response Status: Revised    Commenter Satisfaction: Yes    Category: -

D2.0 has implemented modifications to multicast connectivity feature for Package A. In the new text, some of the mandatory requirements were duplicated or were not very clear.
The descriptions of the specific issues are shown in rmtf_1510_kramer_multicast_issues_1.pdf

Update section 7.4.5 as shown in rmtf_1512_kramer_multicast_operation_1.pdf

Per comment. Change all instances of "e.g," in the changes to "e.g.,"

In section 7.4.5.2.2 change "it performs one of the following actions" to "it performs the following actions"

Change "The rule modification involved ..." to "The rule modification involves ..."

In the proposed new text, change:
"To ensure that the multicast session to the existing multicast clients is not ..."
to
"To ensure that the multicast sessions currently being forwarded to the existing multicast clients are not ..."

#wg-1-5  Type: T    TF: WG    Clause: 7.4.5.2.2    Page: 140    Line: -    Commenter: Marek Hajduczenia / Bright House Networks

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

"When the OLT determines that there are no multicast clients for an IP multicast session connected to an ONU UNI port, the OLT shall modify the associated classification and forwarding rules at the ONU to stop forwarding the indicated multicast session to the UNI port (see 7.4.5.3.3)." - there is no statement on how this is achieved

The exact mechanism is outside the scope of this spec, but we should mention it. Add "The method used to determine that there are no multicast clients for an IP multicast session connected to an ONU UNI port is outside the scope of this standard."

The method used to determine if multicast clients exist or not is described in 7.4.2.1 item (d)(2)

#wg-1-6  Type: T    TF: WG    Clause: 7.4.5.2.2    Page: 140    Line: -    Commenter: Marek Hajduczenia / Bright House Networks

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

"When the OLT determines that there are no multicast clients for an IP multicast session connected to any of the UNI ports on an ONU, the OLT shall delete the associated classification and forwarding rule (see 7.4.5.3.3)." - there is no statement on how this is achieved

The exact mechanism is outside the scope of this spec, but we should mention it. Add "The method used to determine that there are no multicast clients for an IP multicast session connected to any of the UNI ports on an ONU is outside the scope of this standard."

The method used to determine if multicast clients exist or not is described in 7.4.2.1 item (d)(2)

#wg-1-10 Type: E    TF: WG    Clause: 7.4.2.1    Page: 149    Line: -    Commenter: Curtis Knittle / CableLabs

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

Need space at beginning, and "form" should be "from"

Add space at beginning, plus change "IGMP/MLD requests form the multicast" to "IGMP/MLD requests from the multicast"

-

#wg-1-11 Type: E    TF: WG    Clause: 7.4.5.1    Page: 169    Line: -    Commenter: Curtis Knittle / CableLabs

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

"fileds" should be "fields"

Change "… require multiple fileds to classify frames …" to "… require multiple fields to classify frames …"

-

#wg-1-12 Type: E    TF: WG    Clause: 7.4.5.1    Page: 169    Line: -    Commenter: Curtis Knittle / CableLabs

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

"desitination" should be "destination"

Change "desitination" to "destination"

-

#wg-1-13 Type: E    TF: WG    Clause: 7.4.5.2.2    Page: 170    Line: -    Commenter: Curtis Knittle / CableLabs

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

| Wording sounds funny |
| --- |
| Change "involved" to "involves" |
| resolved in wg-1-27 |

---

#wg-1-40 Type: E    TF: WG    Clause: 7.4.5.4.2    Page: 177    Line: -    Commenter: Mark Laubach / Broadcom Corporation

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

| Table 7-41 table footnote (e) missing period at end of sentence. |
| --- |
| Add period |
| - |

---

#wg-1-41 Type: E    TF: WG    Clause: 8.4.1.2    Page: 185    Line: -    Commenter: Mark Laubach / Broadcom Corporation

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

| Referring to footnote (a), missing period at end of sentence, as compared to footnote (a) on the next page (186). |
| --- |
| Check all footnotes in draft and be consistent with use of terminating period. |
| - |

---

#wg-1-33 Type: E    TF: WG    Clause: 9.3.3.4.4    Page: 215    Line: -    Commenter: Glen Kramer / Broadcom

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

| Links for cross-reference 9.2.4.8 on pages 215, 220, and 227 are dead. |
| --- |
| Restore the links |
| - |

---

#wg-1-39 Type: TR    TF: WG    Clause: 12.2.1.2.2.5    Page: 307    Line: -    Commenter: Glen Kramer / Broadcom

Comment Status: Resolved    Response Status: Accept    Commenter Satisfaction: Yes    Category: -

| Incomplete implementation of MR #20150119_2025 |
| --- |
| Change Revision value from 0x10 to 0x01 in the definition of eOAMR_RevisionNack |
| - |

---

#wg-1-29 Type: T    TF: WG    Clause: 12.3.1.6.6    Page: 343    Line: -    Commenter: Glen Kramer / Broadcom

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

| In state diagram 12-16, in state ACTIVATION_ERROR, the primitive eOAM_AIRe_Fail should be eOAMI_AIRe_Fail |
| --- |
| Add "I" after "eOAM" |
| In addition to proposed change, in Figure 12-17, change "fetchError(eOAM_CIRe_Fail)" to "fetchError(eOAMI_CIRe_Fail)"  (add an "I" after eOAM)<br><br>Also in Figure 12-17:<br>- change COMMITT_ERROR to COMMIT_ERROR<br>- change COMMITT_DONE to COMMIT_DONE<br>- change NMSI(committ, fail, errorCode) to NMSI(commit, fail, errorCode)<br>- change NMSI(committ, fail, errorCode) to NMSI(commit, fail, errorCode)<br>- change NMSR(committ, start) to NMSR(commit, start) |

---

#wg-1-30 Type: TR    TF: WG    Clause: 12.3.3.2.6    Page: 361    Line: -    Commenter: Glen Kramer / Broadcom

Comment Status: Resolved    Response Status: Accept    Commenter Satisfaction: Yes    Category: -

| In state diagram 12-22, in state COMMIT_ERROR, wrong primitive is used. |
| --- |
| Change "eOAMI_FTA_Error.ResponseCode" to "eOAMI_FTA_ErrorCommit.ResponseCode" |
| - |

---

#wg-1-18 Type: T    TF: WG    Clause: 13.4.1.1    Page: 427    Line: -    Commenter: Glen Kramer / Broadcom

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

| Wrong cross reference |
| --- |
| Change Table 14-78 to Table 13-80 |
| - |

---

#wg-1-35 Type: T    TF: WG    Clause: 13.4.1.3.2    Page: 432    Line: -    Commenter: Glen Kramer / Broadcom

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

| Each Event Notification TLVs carries identification of an object that generated an alarm. However, there is no information which LLID should carry an alarm, since same objects may be served by / accessed via multiple LLIDs. |
| --- |
| Insert the following text after the Table 13-85:<br>"An ONU may transmit any alarm via any L-ONU, i.e., on any bi-directional LLID registered at that ONU." |
| - |

**#wg-1-38 Type: T     TF: WG     Clause: 13.4.1.3.2          Page: 432      Line: -   Commenter: Glen Kramer / Broadcom**

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

Per MR #20140915_1412, In Table 13-84, the size of ObjectInstance field was changed to 1,2, or 4 octets. However, in DPoE2.0 OAM i07, the size is shown as 2 or 4 octets.

Align the definition of this field with DPoE2.0 OAM i07

Editor's proposed response:
The current size of 1, 2, or 4 is correct - see 14.4.1.1.2, where 14.4.1.1.2.1, 14.4.1.1.2.2, 14.4.1.1.2.3, 14.4.1.1.2.4 are all 1 octet wide, 14.4.1.1.2.5 is 4 octsts wide, 14.4.1.1.2.6 is 2 octets wide.
An MR to DPoE OAM spec should be considered instead.

Resolved at the meeting: today's implementation uses two bytes even thought the object instance width may only require 1 byte. For backward compatibility reasons we should align with DPoE-SP-OAMv2.0-I08 and use either 2 or 4 bytes. The Note for this field explains the Queue instance is 4 bytes, but all other instances requires 2 bytes.

**#wg-1-34 Type: T     TF: WG     Clause: 13.4.2.1          Page: 435      Line: -   Commenter: Glen Kramer / Broadcom**

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

Inconsistent formatting in Table 13-87. The text "Reserved, ignored on reception"spans 1 or 2 columns for different fields.

Make the text "Reserved, ignored on reception" span two columns for opcodes 0x05, 0x06, 0x07, 0x0A, 0x0B, 0x0C.

Also remove 13.4.2.9 from the table cell.

Changed to Technical.

**#wg-1-15 Type: ER     TF: WG     Clause: 13.4.2.6.1          Page: 438      Line: -   Commenter: Glen Kramer / Broadcom**

Comment Status: Resolved    Response Status: Accept        Commenter Satisfaction: Yes              Category: -

A reference in text points to Table 13-96 instead of 13-92. All remaining table cross-references point to 4 tables ahead of the correct one.

Correct cross-references to tables 13-92 through 13-104. Also, verify cross-references located in PICS

-

**#wg-1-37 Type: TR     TF: WG     Clause: 13.4.4          Page: 446      Line: -   Commenter: Glen Kramer / Broadcom**

Comment Status: Resolved    Response Status: Accept        Commenter Satisfaction: Yes              Category: -

Several issues with the implementation of MR #20140212_1524:

1) The accepted resolution of this MR has removed the notion of Critical TLVs and the associated requirement to deregister the ONU is the response to a Critical TLV delayed by more than a second. But the text added to the draft says: "If the remote_response_timer times out for a request associated with a critical TLV, the OLT proceeds to deregister the associated ONU."

2) "the ONU shall generate a response within 1 second of the OLT's transmission toward the destination ONU." ONU cannot comply with this requirement, because it doesn't know when the OLT tramsmitted the eOAMPDU request. The ONU timer should start when it receives the request (i.e., when the Request is passed from MAC to OAM client).

3) Section 13.4.4 added two new mandotory ONU requirements, but corresponding PICS are missing

4) The paragraph starting with "In an example implementation" is confusing and unnecessary. First, there must be an explanation that the remote_response_timer needs to be longer than 1 second (or ONU local timer should be shorter than 1 second.) For example, in MPCP, the Rx timeout is 5x the Tx timeout. Second, a timer per each eAOM_request won't work. An eOAM_Request can contain multiple TLVs and responses to each TLV can come in different eOAM_Response messages. So, there should be separate timers for each TLV.  And finally, in case of multi-eOAMPDU response, does the OLT timer stop when the first eOAMPDU response is received or the last one?

1) Delete paragraph starting with "In an example implementation"

2) Change sentence "In order to guarantee timely delivery of such responses, the ONU shall generate a response within 1 second of the OLT's transmission toward the destination ONU."
to
"The ONU shall generate an eOAM_Get_Response or eOAM_Set_Response eOAMPDU within 1 second of the reception of the corresponding eOAM_Get_Request or eOAM_Set_Request  eOAMPDU from the OLT."

3) Add PICS for "The ONU shall generate an eOAM_Get_Response or eOAM_Set_Response eOAMPDU within 1 second of the reception of the corresponding eOAM_Get_Request or eOAM_Set_Request  eOAMPDU from the OLT."

4) Add PICS for "If an ONU cannot respond to the OLT request before the expiration of 1-second window, the ONU shall generate the ONU Busy alarm (see 13.4.1.3.2.6)."

-

**#wg-1-42 Type: E     TF: WG     Clause: 13.4.1.3.2.5          Page: 463      Line: -   Commenter: Mark Laubach / Broadcom Corporation**

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

Format table to keep the two lines and header on the same page, don't split last row on next page.

As per comment.

Force Table 13-86 to start at the top of the page.

**#wg-1-43 Type: T     TF: WG     Clause: 13.4.4          Page: 477      Line: -   Commenter: Mark Laubach / Broadcom Corporation**

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

The ONU has no knowledge of when an OLT transmits something nor where timing references are inside the OLT.

Change: "of the OLT's transmission toward the destination ONU." to "of receiving a transmission from the OLT."

See comment #wg-1-37 for details

**#wg-1-44 Type: T     TF: WG     Clause: 14.2.2.22          Page: 509      Line: -   Commenter: Mark Laubach / Broadcom Corporation**

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

Given an "and" conjunction, the second "shall" clause in the sentence is redundant with the first "shall".

Consider changing "and the OLT shall place the value" to "and place the value"

No changes to CT-ME30b PICS needed.

#wg-1-19 Type: T     TF: WG     Clause: 14.4.1.1.2.6     Page: 561     Line: -   Commenter: Glen Kramer / Broadcom

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

Wrong cross reference to Table 14-128. It should point to 14-131.
The subsequent cross-references to Tables 14-132 through 14-149 link to correct tables, but show the number that is one off (i.e., show numbers 14-131 through 14-148)

Change the cross reference to Table 14-131.
Change subsequent cross-references to show the correct table numbers.
Correct cfross-references in PICS.

-

---

#wg-1-31 Type: ER     TF: WG     Clause: 14.4.3.1.15     Page: 576     Line: -   Commenter: Glen Kramer / Broadcom

Comment Status: Resolved     Response Status: Revised     Commenter Satisfaction: Yes          Category: -

Two attributes have "NVS" abbreviation added to their respective subclause titles. This is not the style used for SIEPON attributes. The same subclauses describe TLV formats, and "NVS" designation is meaningless for the TLVs. Also, in the future, we may have attributes where only some of their sub-attributes need to be in NVS.

Remove "NVS" from the clause titles and from the  list of abbreviations.
For all the relevant sub-attributes, after the parameter "Remote access: Read/Write" add a new parameter "Storage: Persistent" (or "Storage: Non-Volatile").

Remove "NVS" from the clause titles and from the  list of abbreviations.
For all the relevant sub-attributes, after the parameter "Remote access: Read/Write" add a new parameter ", Storage: Non-Volatile".

---

#wg-1-20 Type: T     TF: WG     Clause: 14.4.3.1.17     Page: 578     Line: -   Commenter: Glen Kramer / Broadcom

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

Wrong cross-reference to Table 14-147. Should be Table 14-150.

Correct the cross-reference in text and in PICS.

-

---

#wg-1-21 Type: T     TF: WG     Clause: 14.4.3.1.18     Page: 579     Line: -   Commenter: Glen Kramer / Broadcom

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

Wrong cross-reference to Table 14-147. Should be Table 14-151.

Correct the cross-reference in text and in PICS.

-

---

#wg-1-22 Type: T     TF: WG     Clause: 14.4.3.1.19     Page: 579     Line: -   Commenter: Glen Kramer / Broadcom

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

Wrong cross-reference to Table 14-147. Should be Table 14-152.

Correct the cross-reference in text and in PICS.

-

---

#wg-1-23 Type: T     TF: WG     Clause: 14.4.3.1.20     Page: 580     Line: -   Commenter: Glen Kramer / Broadcom

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

Wrong cross-reference to Table 14-147. Should be Table 14-153.

Correct the cross-reference in text and in PICS.

-

---

#wg-1-24 Type: T     TF: WG     Clause: 14.4.3.1.21     Page: 581     Line: -   Commenter: Glen Kramer / Broadcom

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

Wrong Cress reference to Table 14-163. Should be Table 14-154.

Correct the cross-reference. Make the link live.

-

---

#wg-1-25 Type: T     TF: WG     Clause: 14.4.3.2.1     Page: 582     Line: -   Commenter: Glen Kramer / Broadcom

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

Starting with Table 14-155 and until the end of Clause 14, all reference to Tables in text point to correct tables but show the table number lagging by 6, 5 or up to 12 the actual table number.

Correct the cross-references in text and in PICS.

-

---

#wg-1-45 Type: T     TF: WG     Clause: 14.4.1.1.1     Page: 589     Line: -   Commenter: Mark Laubach / Broadcom Corporation

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

In Table 14-125, Initially, I was confused by seeing both "reserved" and "allocated" for the two rows 0x00-05 and 0x00-07.   Generally "reserved" means unused, however I believe it may mean not used In 1904 but used in DPoE-SP-OAMv2.  Is this correct?

If intended to use both "reserved" and (intended) "allocated", perhaps changing to the note to "Only for use in DPoE-SP-OAMv2" or something similar might make it more clear.  Otherwise, just mark as reserved in the 1904 standard and leave the note blank as a 1904 only implementation would implement this correctly.

See wq-1-46.

in Table 14-125 change all instances of "Allocated in DPoE-SP-OAMv2" to "See DPoE-SP-OAM for details"

---

#wg-1-46 Type: E    TF: WG    Clause: 14.4.1.1.1    Page: 589    Line: -    Commenter: Mark Laubach / Broadcom Corporation

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

"DPoE-SP-OAMv2" is not listed as a normative reference in Clause 2

If using "DPoE-SP-OAMv2" in Table 14-125, then add the reference to Clause 2.

Make all references "DPoE-SP-OAM" point to the latest version of DPoEv2.0 OAM specificaton.

Also, update existing references as follows (they are outdated now), making DPoEv2.0 as base normative spec, rather than DPoEv1.0. Use the latest v2.0 Ixx revision available (for example, MULPI, OSSI, and OAM recently came out with new versions)

CM-SP-MULPI, (CM-SP-MULPIv3.0-I28-150827), Cable Modem to Customer Premise Equipment Interface Specification.
DPoE-SP-MULPI, (DPoE-SP-MULPIv2.0-I08-150220), DOCSIS® Provisioning of EPON Specifications—DPoE™ MAC and Upper Layer Protocols Requirements.
DPoE-SP-OAMv1.0, (DPoE-SP-OAMv1.0-I01-110225), DOCSIS® Provisioning of EPON Specifications—DPoE™ OAM Extensions Specification.
DPoE-SP-OSSI, (DPoE-SP-OSSIv2.0-I07-150910), DOCSIS® Provisioning of EPON Specifications—DPoE™ Operations and Support System Interface Specification.
DPoE-SP-PHY, (DPoE-SP-PHYv2.0-I04-140807), DOCSIS® Provisioning of EPON Specifications—DPoE™ Physical Layer Specification.
DPoE-SP-SEC, (DPoE-SP-SECv2.0-I04-140807), DOCSIS® Provisioning of EPON Specifications—DPoE™ Security Specification.

---

#wg-1-8 Type: E    TF: WG    Clause: 14.4.3.1.1    Page: 596    Line: -    Commenter: Marek Hajduczenia / Bright House Networks

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

Update cross refrences for tables with TLV structure. For example in 14.4.3.1.1, the reference reads "The Variable Container TLV for the Sequence TLV shall be as specified in Table 14-133." but points to Table 14-134.
Starting in 14.4.3.1.17, references to TLV tables are all broken - in 14.4.3.1.17, we point to Table 14-148 (ONU CVC Validity TLV (0xD7/0x00-0F)), rather than to Table 14-150 (Vendor Name TLV (0xD7/0x00-11))
The same applies to PICS, where references to individual tables need to be also fixed.

-

See wq-1-19

---

#wg-1-49 Type: T    TF: WG    Clause: 14.4.3.1.17    Page: 608    Line: -    Commenter: Mark Laubach / Broadcom Corporation

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

In Table 14-150, under the size column "Varies" is technically broader then the preceding size specification in the definition.  Same for Table 14-151 and Table 14-152.

Consider changing "Varies" to "1..32" to be consistent with variable size length used in other tables.

The current way of specifying is technically correct and avoid repetition of the same information already specified clearly, leading to introduction of potential issues and additional maintenance down the road.

---

#wg-1-47 Type: E    TF: WG    Clause: -    Page: 611    Line: -    Commenter: Mark Laubach / Broadcom Corporation

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

In Table 14-153 for the "Notes" column for the "Downstream" and "Upstream" field rows, consider left format rather than justify.  This should fix the visual padding errors.

As per comments.

-

---

#wg-1-48 Type: E    TF: WG    Clause: 14.4.3.1.21    Page: 622    Line: -    Commenter: Mark Laubach / Broadcom Corporation

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

This is only a comment against the markup file and not the draft specification.  What does green text mean in the markup file?

-

Green text in markup indicating text being moved around, i.e., existing text being moved to a different location.
No changes to draft needed.

---

#wg-1-26 Type: T    TF: WG    Clause: 14.4.3.9.1    Page: 654    Line: -    Commenter: Glen Kramer / Broadcom

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

Cross-references to Tables 14-257, 14-258, 14-259, 14-260, and 14-265 all shown as Table 14-256.

Correct the cross-references in text and in PICS.

-

---

#wg-1-50 Type: T    TF: WG    Clause: 14.4.3.6.1    Page: 654    Line: -    Commenter: Mark Laubach / Broadcom Corporation

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

Where is the "structure" syntax type defined?  The two occurences here are unique in the draft.

Please provide clarity on how one determines the syntax details of "structure".

In this case: "The sClause sub-attribute is itself a compound sub-attribute that consists of multiple sub-attributes.", i.e., it is a series of field entries, where each field entry has the value defined in 14.4.3.6.1.1.

---

#wg-1-51 Type: T    TF: WG    Clause: 14.4.3.7.3    Page: 677    Line: -    Commenter: Mark Laubach / Broadcom Corporation

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

Shall we leave it to be assumed the ignore is normative behaviour?

Consider changing "the OLT and the ONU ignore the sub-attribute" to "the OLT and the ONU shall ignore the sub-attribute"

"ignoring" a sub-attribute is not really testable externally - the value does not make sense for mLLID in this case, even if the ONU/OLT choose NOT to ignore it.

---

#wg-1-32 Type: T    TF: WG    Clause: 4A.2.13    Page: 688    Line: -    Commenter: Glen Kramer / Broadcom

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

Attribute aOnuFwFileName has been moved to a different sub-clause. The associated PICS needs to point to new clause

In PICSs AU-ME32a, AU-ME32b, and AT-ME32 replace "14.4.3.2.14" with "14.4.3.1.21"
In PICSs AU-ME33 and AT-ME33, replace "14.4.3.2.15" with "14.4.3.2.14"

-

#wg-1-7 Type: T    TF: WG    Clause: 14.4.3.11        Page:  691    Line: -   Commenter: Marek Hajduczenia / Bright House Networks

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

| DEMARC auto-configuration mechanism is being withdrawn from DPoE specifications |
|---|

Remove 14.4.3.11 and associated PICS (AT-ME139, AT-ME140, AT-ME141, AT-ME142, AU-ME139, AU-ME140, AU-ME141, AU-ME142) - do not renumber PICs
In Table 14-133, remove "Object group: Demarc auto-configuration", Mark entries for 0x08-00 through 0x08-03 as reserved (currently assigned to aDacConfig, aDacConfigFlags, aDacPassChallenge, aDacStatus).

In Table 14-133 for the attributes 0x0820-0x0822, change to proper clause.

Check all entries in Table 14-133 to make sure referenced clauses are correct.

Make sure all other references to DEMARC are removed.

Remove any associated PICS related to DEMARC.

---

#wg-1-28 Type: TR    TF: WG    Clause: 4A.2.18        Page:  701    Line: -   Commenter: Glen Kramer / Broadcom

Comment Status: Resolved   Response Status: Revised      Commenter Satisfaction: Yes           Category: -

| D2.0 has implemented modifications to multicast connectivity feature for Package A, but PICS were not updated to reflect the new specification. |
|---|

Modify PICS for Multicast for Package A, as shown in rmtf_1512_kramer_multicast_pics_1.pdf. Note: the proposed modifications relect the updated clause 7.4.5 per rmtf_1512_kramer_multicast_operation_1.pdf.

Implement all changes except for changes to 4A.2.1 and 4A.2.2, which were NOT removed in the draft D2.0.