broadband forum

TR-249
Testing of G.993.2 Self-FEXT Cancellation (vectoring)

Notice

The Broadband Forum is a non-profit corporation organized to create guidelines for broadband network system development and deployment. This Broadband Forum Technical Report has been approved by members of the Forum. This Broadband Forum Technical Report is not binding on the Broadband Forum, any of its members, or any developer or service provider. This Broadband Forum Technical Report is subject to change, but only with approval of members of the Forum. This Technical Report is copyrighted by the Broadband Forum, and all rights are reserved. Portions of this Technical Report may be copyrighted by Broadband Forum members.

THIS SPECIFICATION IS BEING OFFERED WITHOUT ANY WARRANTY WHATSOEVER, AND IN PARTICULAR, ANY WARRANTY OF NONINFRINGEMENT IS EXPRESSLY DISCLAIMED. ANY USE OF THIS SPECIFICATION SHALL BE MADE ENTIRELY AT THE IMPLEMENTER'S OWN RISK, AND NEITHER the Forum, NOR ANY OF ITS MEMBERS OR SUBMITTERS, SHALL HAVE ANY LIABILITY WHATSOEVER TO ANY IMPLEMENTER OR THIRD PARTY FOR ANY DAMAGES OF ANY NATURE WHATSOEVER, DIRECTLY OR INDIRECTLY, ARISING FROM THE USE OF THIS SPECIFICATION.

Broadband Forum Technical Reports may be copied, downloaded, stored on a server or otherwise re-distributed in their entirety only, and may not be modified without the advance written permission of the Broadband Forum.

The text of this notice must be included in all copies of this Broadband Forum Technical Report.

Issue History

Issue Number	Approval Date	Publication Date	Issue Editor	Changes
1	8 September 2014	25 September 2014	Frank Van der Putten, Alcatel-Lucent	Original

Comments or questions about this Broadband Forum Technical Report should be directed to help@broadband-forum.org.

Editor	Frank Van der Putten	Alcatel-Lucent	frank.van_der_putten@alcatel-lucent.com
Metallic Testing WG Chair	Les Brown	Huawei Technologies	lesbrown@sympatico.ca
Vice Chair	Lincoln Lavoie	UNH InterOperability Lab	lylavoie@iol.unh.edu
Vice Chair	Massimo Sorbara	Ikanos Communications	msorbara@ikanos.com

September 2014   3 of 10

Table of Contents

Executive Summary

TR-249 Issue 1 [1] provides a set of performance and functional requirements for vectoring capable VDSL2 implementations according to ITU-T Recommendation G.993.5. This Amendment to TR-249 Issue 1 enhances the performance targets defined in TR-249 Issue 1 (expressed as "SHOULD") into requirements (expressed as "SHALL").

September 2014   5 of 10

1   Purpose and Scope

1.1   Purpose

See *Section 1.1/TR-249 Issue 1*.

1.2   Scope

See *Section 1.2/TR-249 Issue 1*.

2   References and Terminology

2.1   Conventions

In this Technical Report, several words are used to signify the requirements of the specification. These words are always capitalized. More information can be found be in RFC 2119 [2].

SHALL	This word, or the term "REQUIRED", means that the definition is an absolute requirement of the specification.
SHALL NOT	This phrase means that the definition is an absolute prohibition of the specification.
SHOULD	This word, or the term "RECOMMENDED", means that there could exist valid reasons in particular circumstances to ignore this item, but the full implications need to be understood and carefully weighed before choosing a different course.
SHOULD NOT	This phrase, or the phrase "NOT RECOMMENDED" means that there could exist valid reasons in particular circumstances when the particular behavior is acceptable or even useful, but the full implications need to be understood and the case carefully weighed before implementing any behavior described with this label.
MAY	This word, or the term "OPTIONAL", means that this item is one of an allowed set of alternatives. An implementation that does not include this option SHALL be prepared to inter-operate with another implementation that does include the option.

2.2   References

The following references are of relevance to this Technical Report. At the time of publication, the editions indicated were valid. All references are subject to revision; users of this Technical Report are therefore encouraged to investigate the possibility of applying the most recent edition of the references listed below.

A list of currently valid Broadband Forum Technical Reports is published at www.broadband-forum.org.

See *Section 2.2/TR-249 Issue 1*.

Document		Title	Source	Year
[1]	TR-249 Issue 1	*Testing of G.993.2 Self-FEXT Cancellation (vectoring)*	BBF	2014
[2]	RFC 2119	*Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels*	IETF	1997

2.3   Definitions

The following terminology is used throughout this Technical Report.

See *Section 2.3/TR-249 Issue 1*.

2.4   Abbreviations

This Technical Report uses the following abbreviations:

See *Section 2.4/TR-249 Issue 1*.

2.5   G.997.1 Parameters

This Technical Report uses the following G.997.1 Parameters:

See *Section 2.5/TR-249 Issue 1*.

3   Technical Report Impact

3.1   Energy Efficiency

TR-249 has no impact on energy efficiency.

3.2   IPv6

TR-249 has no impact on IPv6.

3.3   Security

TR-249 has no impact on security.

3.4   Privacy

Any issues regarding privacy are not affected by TR-249.

4 Changes relative to TR-249 Issue 1

NOTE – Section numbering below refers to sections as numbered in TR-249 Issue 1.

8.1.4 Pass/Fail criteria

For the test to pass, all of the following 6 performance criteria ~~SHOULD~~SHALL be met: ...

8.2.4 Pass/Fail criteria

For the test to pass, the 6 performance criteria defined in section 8.1.4 ~~SHOULD~~SHALL be met, with replacing "N" with "N-Nlegacy".

8.3.4 Pass/Fail criteria

For the test to pass, the 3 downstream performance criteria defined in section 8.1.4 ~~SHOULD~~SHALL be met over the set of N-Nfriendly vectored lines.

8.4.4 Pass/Fail criteria

For the test to pass, the 6 performance criteria defined in section 8.1.4 ~~SHOULD~~SHALL be met.

8.5.4 Pass/Fail criteria

For the test to pass, the 6 performance criteria defined in section 8.1.4 ~~SHOULD~~SHALL be met.

End of Broadband Forum Technical Report TR-249