Cl **03** *SC* **3.2.7** *P* **21** *L* **24** # 13

GEIPEL, MICHAEL D Individual

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **R**

The line "shall support at least one of the three MAC Client Data field sizes"...does not convey the intent, given that the only requirement is that the value be greater than or equal to 1500.

SuggestedRemedy

Change:=====Ethernet implementations shall support at least one of three maximum MAC Client Data field sizes as defined below:a) 1500 decimal - basic frames (see 1.4.x).b) 1504 decimal - Q-tagged frames (see 1.4.x).c) 1982 decimal - envelope frames (see 1.4.x).

To:=====Ethernet implementations that support MAC Client Data field sizes of at least:

a) at least 1500 decimal - support basic frames (see 1.4.x).

b) at least 1504 decimal - support basic fames and Q-tagged frames (see 1.4.x).

c) up to 1982 decimal - support basic, Q-tagged and envelope frames (see 1.4.x).

Response *Response Status* **C**

REJECT.

The removal of the shall statement and use of 'at least' removes the requirement that the value is an enumerated list, which is a requirement.

In addition, the additional frame types were removed because previous commentors found them confusing.

As well, this comment is not on changed text.

Cl **03** *SC* **3.2.8** *P* *L* # 1

PARSONS, GLENN W Individual

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

The pad (or the pad field) is not counted in the length/type field. However, several wording changes have been made to make the text more precise by naming specific fields in 3.2.6 and 3.2.8. In 3.2.8 the new sentence now contradicts itself to say both that pad is in and after 'MAC Client Data'. We can either rewrite this sentence or insert the word 'field' twice to correct this.

SuggestedRemedy

OLD:If necessary, the MAC Client Data field is extended by appending extra bits (that is, a pad) in units of octets after the MAC Client Data field but prior to calculating and appending the FCS.

NEW:If necessary, the MAC Client Data field is extended by appending extra bits (that is, a Pad field) in units of octets after the MAC Client Data field but prior to calculating and appending the FCS field.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Replace sentence with the following:

NEW: If necessary, a Pad field (in units of octets) is appended after the MAC Client Data field prior to calculating and appending the FCS field.

Also in 3.2.6 change to:

... will be added after of the MAC Client Datadata field but prior to the FCS field, specified below.

Cl **04** *SC* **4.2.3** *P* **25** *L* **30** # 12

BOOTH, MR BRAD J Individual

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **A**

Incorrect usage of "inter" in "inter packet gap". The term should be used as a prefix; therefore, there should be no space between "inter" and "packet".

SuggestedRemedy

Change "inter packet" to be "interpacket" throughout the draft.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

However, this comment is not on changed text.

Cl **04** *SC* **4.3.2.1** *P* **41** *L* **44** # 14

Thaler, Pat

Comment Type **G** *Comment Status* **A**

The resolution to comment 106 agreed to change the titles of the subclauses to match the state diagrame name. That change was only partily implemented.

SuggestedRemedy

The titles for 4.3.2.1 and 4.3.2.2 need to have "interface" inserted.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

This is a useful clarification. The editor did not completely implement the resolution. This needs to be fixed in clause 4 & 4A

However, this comment is not on changed text.

Cl **04** *SC* **4.3.2.2.4** *P* **40** *L* **1** # 15

Thaler, Pat

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A**

Figure 4-8 has been deleted and no replacement figure inserted.

SuggestedRemedy

Put the figure back.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT.

Actually Fig 4-8 is not deleted, the strikeout is intended for the first instance of Table 4-2 on the following page.

This an editting mistake by the editor and will be fixed. No change to the draft is required.

Cl **31** *SC* **31.3** *P* **70** *L* **24** # 2

KRAMER, GLEN Individual

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **R**

The draft seems to give a different meaning to "MAC Client". Typically, an "X client" is an entity located above an "X interface" and using services of the "X interface".In that regard, in absence of MAC Control, the layer above MAC is its MAC Client. When MAC Control sublayer is present, it becomes MAC Client, and the layer above becomes MAC Control Client.But the following paragraph assumes that MAC Client remains a MAC Client whether it is above MAC or MAC Control."The optional MAC Control sublayer is inserted between the MAC sublayer and its MAC client. The MAC Control sublayer uses the MAC service interface to interface to the MAC client and to the MAC."If this is a "new model", then changes also should be made to Figure 3-1, which currently shows packet payload consisting of MAC Client Data only. If MAC Client is not the same as MAC Control (when it is present), then this figure should show payload consisting of MAC Client data or MAC Control data. And of course, the relevant changes should be made to subclause 3.2.7.Also, later in 31.3 it says "Clients of the MAC Control sublayer may generate either MCF:MA_CONTROL.request or MCF:MA_DATA.request primitives." Who are these clients? Is one of Mac Control clients the same as Mac Client, since they both can generate MA_DATA.request primitives?

SuggestedRemedy

Either keep the "old model" where any entity above MAC is a MAC Client or modify relevant text and figures to show that payload can consist of MAC Client Data or MAC Control data. Here are a few locations I see: sc 3.1.1, Fig 3-1, sc 3.2.7, sc 4a.2.9, sc 31.3.

Response *Response Status* **W**

REJECT.

This project fixed the inconsistency between clause 2 & 31. The document is now aligned to show that MAC control is transparent to the MAC client. As a result, no change is needed here.

Also, this comment is not on changed text and out of scope.

If any inconsistencies between clause 31 and 64 need to be addressed, they should be raised in a revision project or an EPON amendment project.

Options (Chicago straw poll results - 18 in attendance):
1. accept proposed response above (11)
2. accept proposed response above AND also apply to clause 64 (0)
3. split superior interfaces into 'MAC client' and 'MAC control client' in 31 (4)
4. split superior interfaces into 'MAC client' and 'MAC control client' in 31 & 64 (0)
5. accept proposed remedy (it is only 'MAC control client') in 31 (0)

Options (straw poll)
1. accept proposed response above (10)

2. split superior interfaces into 'MAC client' and 'MAC control client' in 31 (3)

Motion (1st - Tom Dineen, 2nd Tom Mathey)
Accept proposed response
Y - 10 N - 0 A - 5

Cl **31** *SC* **Fig 31-4** *P* **77** *L* **8** # 6

KRAMER, GLEN Individual

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A**

The two MA_DATA.indication primitives should have "MAC" and "MCF" interface qualifiers, as is done in Figures 31-2 and 31B-1.

SuggestedRemedy

Add the interface qualifiers.

Response *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

This is a useful clarification. The top one should be MAC and the bottom MCF

However, this comment is not on changed text.

Cl **4A** *SC* **4A.3.2** *P* **55** *L* **13** # 3

KRAMER, GLEN Individual

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A**

Refer to text "For historical reasons the MAC sublayer definitions use two similar but subtely different functions, TransmitFrame and ReceiveFrame defined in 4A.3.2.3."First, the TransmitFrame and ReceiveFrame are not "subtly" different. They are very different. Second, I could not find subclause 4A.3.2.3.The next sentence says: "The relationship between these two sets of functions &". Which sets?

SuggestedRemedy

I am not sure what the above text intended to say, but it does not say it. My proposed remedy is to remove this text, but I will readily accept a clarified version of it.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The editor omitted aligning 4A.3.2 with 4.3.2 which was changed to clarify this text in this draft.

These should be aligned.

However, this comment is not on changed text.

Cl **4A** *SC* **4A.3.2.1** *P* **55** *L* **19** # 5

KRAMER, GLEN Individual

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **R**

The state diagram described in this subclause explains how externally triggered MA_DATA.request primitive invokes TransmitFrame function inside the MAC. However, the clause title seems to imply that the described state diagram is implemented inside MAC Client, not inside the MAC.

SuggestedRemedy

Title of 4A.3.2.1 should say "MAC transmit state diagram".Title of 4A.3.2.1.3 should say "State diagram".Title of Figure 4A-3 should say " MAC transmit state diagram".Also make similar changes to subclause 4A.3.2.2.

Response *Response Status* **W**

REJECT.

The 'MAC transmit state diagram' title is ambiguous.

Related changes were made in comment 14.

As well, this comment was on unchanged text.

Cl **4A** *SC* **4A.3.2.1** *P* **55** *L* **19** # 16

Thaler, Pat

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A**

The resloution of comment 107 was not carried out. The titles of subclauses 4A.3.2.1, 4A.3.2.1.4, 4A.3.2.2 and 4A.3.2.2.4 were suppose to be changed to match the name of the state diagrams.

SuggestedRemedy

Insert "interface" in the subclause titles.

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment 14

Cl **4A** *SC* **Fig 4A-3** *P* **56** *L* **25** # 4

KRAMER, GLEN Individual

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **R**

Refer to figure title.Interfaces do not have state diagrams - interface is simply a mapping of signals.Same for figure 4A-4.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove word interface from the title.Same for Figure 4A-4.

Response *Response Status* **W**

REJECT.

The task force spent considerable time choosing the name for this diagram and clause (per comment 14). The state diagram is for the MAC client interface, essentially mapping the service primitive to the pascal.

As well, this comment is not on changed text.

Cl **64** *SC* **64** *P* *L* # 9

KRAMER, GLEN Individual

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A**

Figure 64-13 is missing. It has function "TransmitFrame" which should have been replaced with MA_DATA.request primitive.

SuggestedRemedy

Do the necessary changes to Figure 64-13, so that it shows in this pdf.

Response *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

It appears that Fig 64-13 was intended to be changed per the editing instructions.

However, it was omitted during the original insertion in D2.1 and not noticed until now.

Insert the figure and change TransmitFrame to MA_DATA.request as appropriate.

However, this comment is not on changed text.

Cl **64** *SC* **64.2.1** *P* **94** *L* **16** # 7

KRAMER, GLEN Individual

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **A**

This is the only place I could see where MA_DATA.indication and MA_DATA.request refer to as "interfaces", instead of as "primitives"

SuggestedRemedy

Rephrase the third paragraph as"Multipoint MAC Control protocol supports several MAC and client interfaces. Only a single MAC interface and Client interface is enabled for transmission at a time. There is a tight mapping between a MAC service interface and a Client service interface. In particular, the assertion of the MAC:MA_DATA.indication primitive in MAC j leads to the assertion of MCF:MA_DATA.indication primitive to Client j. Conversely, the assertion of the request service primitive in Client i generates the MAC:MA_DATA.request primitive of MAC i. Note that the Multipoint MAC sublayer need not receive and transmit packets associated with the same interface at the same time. Thus the Multipoint MAC Control acts like multiple MAC Controls bound together with common elements."Also in paragraph 6 change"The reception of a frame in a MAC enables the MAC:MA_DATA.indication interface of the MAC."to"The reception of a frame in a MAC results in generation of MAC:MA_DATA.indication primitive on that MAC's interface."

Response *Response Status* **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

They should be refered to as primitives in most cases.

Reword text as suggested.

However, this comment is not on changed text.

Cl **64** *SC* **Fig 64-15** *P* **106** *L* **39** # 10

KRAMER, GLEN Individual

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A**

The discovery function does not interface with subordinate sublayers and cannot generate MAC:MA_DATA.request service primitive. It should generate MCI:MA_DATA.request primitive, as is shown in Figure 64-3.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "MAC" to "MCI". Do similar changes in Figures 64-16, 64-17, 64-18, 64-23, 64-25, 64-26, 64-27.

Response *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

This is a useful clarification. The prefix should be MCI in these cases.

Editor will check and edit associated text if necessary.

However, this comment is not on changed text.

Cl **64** *SC* **Fig 64-7** *P* **97** *L* **24** # 8

KRAMER, GLEN Individual

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A**

The MA_DATA.request input to Control Multiplexor is not from interface to MAC Control Client, but to one of internal MAC Control functions.Same applies to Figures 64-8 and 64-12

SuggestedRemedy

Change "MCF:MA_DATA.request" to "MCI:MA_DATA.request" as shown in Figure 64-3.Same for Figures 64-8 and 64-12.

Response *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

This is a useful clarification. The prefix should be MCI in these cases.

Editor will check and edit associated text if necessary.

However, this comment is not on changed text.

Cl **65** *SC* **65.2.2.1** *P* **118** *L* **23** # 11

KRAMER, GLEN Individual

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **A**

The note about frame buffers is not appropriate in the section about data detector. Data detector is not aware of frame structure and its buffer has nothing to do with frame sizes.The buffer in Data detector is a FIFO delay line whose size depends on syncTime and laser-on times.

SuggestedRemedy

Perhaps this note should be moved to FEC section. FEC buffers should be aware of max frame size. The end of subclause 65.2.3.3.4 would be an appropriate location for this note.

Response *Response Status* **W**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

This note is better suited in the overview of clause 65.2 to be consistent with the placement of a similar note in clause 61.1. Move the NOTE to the end of 65.2.1

However, this comment is not on changed text.