

Cl 00 SC P97 L52 # 1773
KIMURA, Mitsunobu Hitachi Communicatio

Comment Type E Comment Status D joint

Title of Figure 76-2 has a period (".").

SuggestedRemedy

The period should be removed.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Moved to c00

Globally remove trailing periods from figure and table captions.

Cl 00 SC 0 P L # 2047
Kramer, Glen Teknovus, Inc.

Comment Type E Comment Status D joint

Usage of i.e. (id est) is inconsistent

Always should be "i.e." (two periods). Depending on style, can follow with a comma.

In draft, we have
5 occurrences of "i.e."
4 occurrences of "i.e.,"
5 occurrences of "ie."

SuggestedRemedy

Use consistent style. Author's preference is "i.e.,"

Do global search and replace.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 00 SC 0 P L # 2172
Woodward, Ted Telcordia Technologie

Comment Type E Comment Status D

in my printout, page numbers were cut off. I directly printed the pdf document on a common (HP8150) laser printer from the PDF files using the latest release of Adobe Acrobat Reader. Unfortunately, this means that I cannot provide page number references in my comments.

SuggestedRemedy

check ability to print on more types of laser printers to make sure page numbers appear.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Elevate footer some.

Cl 00 SC 0 P L # 2251
Ganga, Ilango Intel

Comment Type ER Comment Status D joint

Editing instructions and Editors notes throughout the document are printed in RED color. Per IEEE style manual 21.1 the instructions are in Bold Italics. Change this to black color, bold italics.

This red typically is used to indicate change in compare documents.

SuggestedRemedy

Per comment

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Update in Style guide, import to all clauses.

Cl 00 SC 0 P 0 L 0 # 2344
Hajduczenia, Marek Nokia Siemens Networ

Comment Type ER Comment Status D ie

Use of i.e. is not consistent throughout the draft. There are cases of "i.e." (correct) but also of "i.e" or "ie." and other variations. Please hunt the offending versions and replace with "i.e."

SuggestedRemedy

See above

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment 2047

Cl 00 SC 0 P 0 L 0 # 2343
Hajduczenia, Marek Nokia Siemens Networ

Comment Type E Comment Status D

Editorial notes at the beginning of the Clauses could be aligned in between the clauses to match accordingly. Please use a singular template of the editorial comments.

SuggestedRemedy

See above.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See Style Guide

CI 00 SC 0 P 0 L 0 # 2303
 Hajduczenia, Marek Nokia Siemens Network
 Comment Type E Comment Status D joint
 The draft makes use of terms "asymmetrical" and "asymmetric" interchangeably. Even though both are correct, it would be nice to make use of only one i.e. "asymmetric"
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace all occurrence of "asymmetrical" with "asymmetric".
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 00 SC 0 P 0 L 0 # 2342
 Hajduczenia, Marek Nokia Siemens Network
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D Mpage
 General comment: page numbers in the template got mysteriously very low. On some printers, the page numbers do not print correctly. Please bring the page numbers higher as e.g. in 802.3ay draft.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Please bring the page numbers higher as e.g. in 802.3ay draft. Update the draft template as necessary
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 See comment 2172

CI 00 SC 0 P 0 L 0 # 2345
 Hajduczenia, Marek Nokia Siemens Network
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D
 Editing instructions and Editorial notes in current version of the draft are in RED. As per IEEE style manual, point 21.1, we should be using Bold Italics. Please fix it.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change all red text blocks (editorial comments and instructions) into BOLD Italic as per IEEE Style Manual. The only red text should be only visible in markup versions signalign deletion.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 See comment 2251

CI 00 SC 0 P 1 L 56 # 1904
 Dawe, Piers Avago
 Comment Type E Comment Status D PageNum
 Page numbers are too low, won't print on some printers, and 2 lines lower than in published 802.3
 SuggestedRemedy
 Remove one line-feed in each of left and right page footers
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 See comment 2172

CI 00 SC 00 P L # 1631
 Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks
 Comment Type E Comment Status D joint
 Throughout this draft there are many places where the readability can be improved by small editorial modifications that do not change the meaning. The attached PDF file contains suggested changes indicated using the "Text Edits" tool. Because the editing marks can be difficult to locate, each one has an associated word in the text marked with yellow highlighter. These are generally after the text edit, except where this is near the end of the paragraph. Only pages with proposed edits are included.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Apply these suggested changes.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 As per 3av_0809_anslow_1.pdf with editorial license.

CI 00 SC 00 P 19 L 13 # 1570
 Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks
 Comment Type E Comment Status D joint xref
 In many places in the draft, references have "@@" before and after them. These symbols are inappropriate in a WG draft and reduce the readability of the text. They need to be removed. The cross references that are external to the draft can be marked in some other much less intrusive way such as an alternate colour. This can still be searched for in FrameMaker.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Remove the many occurrences of "@@" through the draft. Show external cross references some other way.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 [Moved to C00, originally was against 31C]
 Will consider reformatting linked text at some time in the future.
 See comment #2346

Cl 00 SC 00 P 202 L 51 # 1999
Brown, Alan Wave7 Optics, Inc.

Comment Type E Comment Status D

The readability of many tables in this document could benefit by consistent formatting. This table, as an example, is missing the darker solid outline at its bottom, which may cause confusion for the reader thinking that the table at the top of the next page is a continuation (until comparing the two table titles).

SuggestedRemedy

Add darker solid outline consistently for all tables.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.
[Moved to C00, originally against C77/77.3.6.12]

Cl 00 SC 00 P 60 L 1 # 1766
KIMURA, Mitsunobu Hitachi Communicatio

Comment Type E Comment Status D typo

The title of the Subclause has a period("."). Also titles of Subclause 75.5 and 75.6 have periods.

SuggestedRemedy

Every title of Subclause should not have a period.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.
[Moved to C00]
[Subclause number was fixed]
Make sure the titles of subclauses do not have 'period' at the end.

Cl 00 SC 00 P 60 L 3 # 2017
Frazier, Howard Broadcom

Comment Type ER Comment Status D subclause

The word "Subclause" should never appear in a cross-reference to a subclause, regardless of whether the cross-reference is to a subclause within the current clause, or to a subclause of another clause.

SuggestedRemedy

Please delete the word "Subclause" from all cross-references.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.
[Moved to C00]

Cl 00 SC 1.4.95 P 12 L 29 # 1908
Dawe, Piers Avago

Comment Type E Comment Status D joint

"Subclause 75.8.1"

SuggestedRemedy

In general, delete every "Subclause". In 1.4 Definitions only, use the format "(See IEEE 802.3, Clause n.)"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.
Moved from c01 to c00

Cl 01 SC 1.4 P 12 L 15 # 1674
Jessica, Jiang Salira

Comment Type E Comment Status D

Duplicate word " 10GBASE-PR:"

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the additional word

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 01 SC 1.4 P 12 L 15 # 1816
D'Ambrosia, John Force10 Networks

Comment Type E Comment Status D

"10GBASE-PR" is repeated twice

SuggestedRemedy

delete redundant "10GBASE-PR" and bold text

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 01 SC 1.4 P 12 L 15 # 1665
Marris, Arthur Cadence

Comment Type E Comment Status D

Duplicate definition names 10GBASE-PR:10GBASE-PR and 10/1GBASE-PRX:10/1GBASE-PRX

SuggestedRemedy

Delete one of them.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 01 **SC 1.4** **P 12** **L 15** # 2263
Hajduczenia, Marek Nokia Siemens Networ

Comment Type E **Comment Status D**
PMD definition is doubled for 10GBASE-PR. The same is true for 10/1GBASE-PRX in line 20. Remove the double PMD definitions from line 15 and 20

SuggestedRemedy
Replace line 15 with "10GBASE-PR: IEEE 802.3 Physical Layer specification for a 10 Gb/s symmetric point-to-"
Replace line 20 with "10/1GBASE-PRX: IEEE 802.3 Physical Layer specification for a 10 Gb/s downstream, 1"

Proposed Response **Response Status W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 01 **SC 1.4** **P 12** **L 15** # 2102
Kramer, Glen Teknovus, Inc.

Comment Type E **Comment Status D**
Labels repeated twice:

line 15 - 10GBASE-PR:10GBASE-PR:
line 20 - 10/1GBASE-PRX:10/1GBASE-PRX:

SuggestedRemedy
Remove one lable on each line

Proposed Response **Response Status W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 01 **SC 1.4** **P 12** **L 20** # 1675
Jessica, Jiang Salira

Comment Type E **Comment Status D**
Duplicate word "10/1GBASE-PRX:"

SuggestedRemedy
Remove the duplicate word

Proposed Response **Response Status W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 01 **SC 1.4** **P 12** **L 20** # 1817
D'Ambrosia, John Force10 Networks

Comment Type E **Comment Status D**
10/1GBASE-PRX is repeated twice.

SuggestedRemedy
delete extra 10/1GBASE-PRX. Bold remaining text

Proposed Response **Response Status W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 01 **SC 1.4** **P 12** **L 30** # 1907
Dawe, Piers Avago

Comment Type T **Comment Status D**
Possible confusion between time-quantum and pause_quantum

SuggestedRemedy
add definitions for both

Proposed Response **Response Status W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 01 **SC 1.4.95** **P 12** **L 28** # |1632|
 Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks

Comment Type **ER** **Comment Status** **D**

clause 1.4.95 has changed to:
 "As used in IEEE 802.3 Clause 38, Clause 52, Clause 53, Clause 58, Clause 59, Clause 60, Clause 68 and Clause 75 for fiber optic links, the static loss of light through a link between a transmitter and receiver. It includes the loss of the fiber, connectors, and splices and optional power splitter/combiner (for details, see @@Subclause 75.8.1@)"
 1) Clause 75.8.1 does not exist.
 2) The optional splitter/combiner is only applicable to clauses 60 and 75
 3) Listing all of the optical clauses forces all future optical amendments to modify this clause
 3) clause 75.9.1 (presumably the intended reference) contains:
 "Insertion loss for SMF fiber optic cabling (channel) is defined at 1270, 1310, 1577 or 1590 nm, depending on the particular PMD. A suitable test method is described in ITU-T G.650.1."
 This is not suitable as a generic reference for insertion loss.

SuggestedRemedy

Change clause 1.4.95 to:
 "As used in IEEE 802.3 for fiber optic links, the static loss of light through a link between a transmitter and receiver. It includes the loss of the fiber, connectors, and splices and for Clause 60 and Clause 75 the optional power splitter/combiner."

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 Moved to clause 01.

Cl 01 **SC 76.1.3.2** **P 100** **L 40** # |2374|
 Law, David 3Com

Comment Type **ER** **Comment Status** **D**

The abbreviation TQ is used here and in two PICS entries, and is not defined anywhere.

SuggestedRemedy

Either define in list of abbreviations or expand out to be time_quantum as used elsewhere.

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Moved to c01
 Add to abbreviations and only use TQ in PICS. (see comment 1939)

Cl 30 **SC 30.2** **P 14** **L 13** # |2252|
 Ganga, Ilango Intel

Comment Type **ER** **Comment Status** **D**

Missing cross references throughout this clause. Add cross references.

Page 14, line 23 Why is 30.4 listed here without any changes? Add changes if appropriate

Page 14, line 31 Editing instruction not very clear. Possible remedy "Insert the following after ..."

Page 15, line 16-30 if appropriate update subclauses 30.6 to 30.11. Are these placeholders without any text.

SuggestedRemedy

As per comment

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 (1) Missing cross references throughout this clause. Add cross references. > Make all hyperlinks live and mark external links appropriately.
 (2) Page 14, line 23 Why is 30.4 listed here without any changes? Add changes if appropriate > Remove, no changes were made
 (3) Page 15, line 16-30 if appropriate update subclauses 30.6 to 30.11. Are these placeholders without any text. > Remove, no changes were made
 (4) Page 14, line 31 Editing instruction not very clear. Possible remedy "Insert the following after ..." > Delete lines 32, 33 on page 14, change editing instructions to read: "add at the end of the list in aMAUType"

Cl 30 **SC 30.3.2.1.2** **P 14** **L 14** # |1676|
 Jessica, Jiang Salira

Comment Type **E** **Comment Status** **D**

symmetric 10G Phy type should be "10GBASE-PR"

Incorrect PMD names

SuggestedRemedy

change "10/1GBASE-PR" to "10GBASE-PR"

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 See comment #2266

Cl 30 SC 30.3.2.1.2 P14 L14 # 2265
 Hajduczenia, Marek Nokia Siemens Networ

Comment Type T Comment Status D Incorrect PMD names
 10/1GBASE-PR is not a correct PMD name - 10GBASE-PR is. Lines 14 and 20 are affected with the same problem.

SuggestedRemedy
 Change "10/1GBASE-PR" to "10GBASE-PR" in line 14 and 20

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 30 SC 30.3.2.1.2 P14 L14 # 1688
 Joergensen, Thomas Vitesse Semiconducto

Comment Type E Comment Status D Incorrect PMD names
 There is nothing like 10/1GBASE-PR

SuggestedRemedy
 Replace 10/1GBASE-PR with 10GBASE-PR

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 [Subclause number was fixed]
 See comment #2266

Cl 30 SC 30.3.2.1.2 P14 L20 # 1677
 Jessica, Jiang Salira

Comment Type E Comment Status D Incorrect PMD names
 symmmetric 10G Phy type should be "10GBASE-PR"

SuggestedRemedy
 change "10/1GBASE-PR" to "10GBASE-PR"

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 See comment #2266

Cl 30 SC 30.3.2.1.3 P14 L20 # 1689
 Joergensen, Thomas Vitesse Semiconducto

Comment Type E Comment Status D Incorrect PMD names
 There is nothing names 10/1GBASE-PR

SuggestedRemedy
 Replace 10/1GBASE-PR with 10GBASE-PR

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 [Subclause number was fixed]
 See comment #2266

Cl 30 SC 30.3.7 P246 L15 # 1912
 Dawe, Piers Avago

Comment Type T Comment Status D
 There are several OMPEmulation managed object definitions that refer to 65.1.3.

SuggestedRemedy
 Modify them as appropriate to refer to 76.1.6.2 also

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 [Page number was added per 802.3ayD2.2, section 2, page 325]
 See comment #1910.

List of changes:

- (1) 30.3.7.1.2aOMPEmulationType - change "65.1.3.1" to "65.1.3.1 and 76.1.6.2.1, where applicable"
- (2) 30.3.7.1.3aSLDErrors - change "65.1.3.3.1" to "65.1.3.3.1 and 76.1.6.2.3.1, where appropriate"
- (3) 30.3.7.1.4aCRC8Errors, 30.3.7.1.5aGoodLLID - change "65.1.3.3.1" to "65.1.3.3.1 and 76.1.6.2.3.1, where appropriate", change "65.1.3.3.3" to "65.1.3.3.3 and 76.1.6.2.3.3, where appropriate"
- (4) 30.3.7.1.6aONUPONcastLLID, 30.3.7.1.7aOLTPONcastLLID, 30.3.7.1.8aBadLLID - change "65.1.3.3.1" to "65.1.3.3.1 and 76.1.6.2.3.1, where appropriate", change "65.1.3.3.2" to "65.1.3.3.2 and 76.1.6.2.3.2, where appropriate", change "65.1.3.3.3" to "65.1.3.3.3 and 76.1.6.2.3.3, where appropriate"

Cl 30 SC 30.5.1.1.15 P15 L13 # 1679
 Jessica, Jiang Salira
 Comment Type E Comment Status D 10/1GBASE-PRX-U
 Should use "10/1GBASE-PRX-U" PHY
 SuggestedRemedy
 change "10GBASE-PRX-U" to "10/1GBASE-PRX-U"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 30 SC 30.5.1.1.15 P15 L7 # 1678
 Jessica, Jiang Salira
 Comment Type E Comment Status D 10/1GBASE-PRX-U
 Should use "10/1GBASE-PRX-U" PHY
 SuggestedRemedy
 change "10GBASE-PRX-U" to "10/1GBASE-PRX-U"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 30 SC 30.5.1.1.15 P15 L7 # 2267
 Hajduczenia, Marek Nokia Siemens Networ
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D 10/1GBASE-PRX-U
 Incorrect PMD name. 10GBASE-PRX does not exist. The same problem exists in line 13,
 page 15, subclause 30.5.1.1.16
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change "10GBASE-PRX" to "10/1GBASE-PRX" in line 7. The same problem exists in line
 13, page 15, subclause 30.5.1.1.16.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 30 SC 30.5.1.1.16 P15 L10 # 2161
 Barrass, Hugh Cisco
 Comment Type T Comment Status D
 The name of the object does not match the register
 "uncorrectable" vs "uncorrected"
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change the object name from "aFECUncorrectableBlocks" to "aFECUncorrectedBlocks"
 Also change in the text.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 [Subclause number was fixed]

Cl 30 SC 30.5.1.1.16 P15 L13 # 1569
 Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks
 Comment Type E Comment Status D
 This says "For 1000BASE-PX, 10GBASE-R PHYs, 10GBASE-PR, or 10GBASE-PRX-U
 PHYs, a count of uncorrectable FEC blocks." which contains a spurious comma and
 "PHYs"
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change to "For 1000BASE-PX, 10GBASE-R, 10GBASE-PR or 10GBASE-PRX-U PHYs, a
 count of uncorrectable FEC blocks." by deleting the comma and "PHYs"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 31A SC 31A P17 L11 # 1922
 Dawe, Piers Avago
 Comment Type T Comment Status D
 Bad English and flat wrong: this reserved range does not run through FF-FD because the
 next possible address is not in the range, as stated in the next row. It stops at FF-FD.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change "00-07 through FF-FD" to "00-07 to FF-FD"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 We are not going to enter into discussions of "to" and "through" (again) :)

Cl 31A **SC 31A** **P 17** **L 13** # 2249
 Ganga, Ilango Intel
Comment Type **E** **Comment Status** **D**
 Provide reference to appropriate clause in third column of table 31-A1
SuggestedRemedy
 Per comment
Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Reference to "Annex 31C" needs to be inserted in third column.

Cl 31A **SC 31A** **P 17** **L 26** # 1633
 Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks
Comment Type **ER** **Comment Status** **D**
 The first row of the table contains "EXTENSION (opcode 0xFFFE)". Extension is spelt incorrectly.
SuggestedRemedy
 change to "EXTENSION (opcode 0xFFFE)"
Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 [Moved to C31A]

Cl 31C **SC 31C.3.1** **P 20** **L 19** # 1925
 Dawe, Piers Avago
Comment Type **E** **Comment Status** **D**
 Font too small
SuggestedRemedy
 Change 7 point to 8 point wherever practical
Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Font 7 is used already. 8 can be used in the next release.

Cl 45 **SC 2.1.10.1** **P 23** **L 37** # 1761
 KIMURA, Mitsunobu Hitachi Communicatio
Comment Type **E** **Comment Status** **D**
 "bit 1.1.9 indicates" should be "bit 1.11.9 indicates".
SuggestedRemedy
 "bit 1.11.9 indicates"
Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 45 **SC 45.2.1** **P 22** **L 20** # 1974
 Dawe, Piers Avago
Comment Type **TR** **Comment Status** **D** **FEC registers**
 You have omitted the strong FEC register from the table: per clause 76 they should not be 1.n registers
SuggestedRemedy
 Add entries for FEC registers in 45.2.3 PCS registers Table 45-82, or perhaps in a FEC MMD. Avoid register/bit clashes with P802.3ba.
Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 See resolution to comment 2272

Cl 45 **SC 45.2.1.10.1** **P 23** **L 37** # 1634
 Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks
Comment Type **ER** **Comment Status** **D**
 The first sentence says "When read as a one, bit 1.1.9 indicates that the PMA/PMD has P2MP abilities listed in register 1.12." This should be "bit 1.11.9" not "bit 1.1.9"
SuggestedRemedy
 Change to "When read as a one, bit 1.11.9 indicates that the PMA/PMD has P2MP abilities listed in register 1.12."
Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Moved to c45
 See resolution to 1761

Cl 45 **SC 45.2.1.11** **P 25** **L 33** # 1818
 D'Ambrosia, John Force10 Networks
Comment Type **E** **Comment Status** **D**
 Table 45-12 is broken.
SuggestedRemedy
 tie 45-12 on Page 25 to rest of table on p 26.
Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 45 SC 45.2.1.11.1 P 26 L 34 # 1636
 Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

The second sentence starts "When read as a one.". This should be "When read as a zero,"
 This error is also present in subclauses 45.2.1.11.2 through 45.2.1.11.11

SuggestedRemedy

change the second sentence of subclauses 45.2.1.11.1 through 45.2.1.11.11 to start with
 "When read as a zero,"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 Changed from "ER" to "TR"
 Moved to c45

CI 45 SC 45.2.1.11.1 P 26 L 34 # 1975
 Dawe, Piers Avago

Comment Type T Comment Status D

"10/ new-line 1GBASE-PRX-D1"

SuggestedRemedy

Either change to e.g. "10_1GBASE-PRX-D1" or use the Frame document option to stop
 line splits after /

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Will attempt to catch splits and fix.

CI 45 SC 45.2.1.11.6 P 27 L 11 # 1637
 Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks

Comment Type ER Comment Status D

clause 45.2.1.11.6 ends "not able to operate as a
 10GBASE-PR-D PMA/PMD type." This should be "not able to operate as a
 10GBASE-PR-D3 PMA/PMD type."

SuggestedRemedy

change clause 45.2.1.11.6 to end "not able to operate as a
 10GBASE-PR-D3 PMA/PMD type."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 Moved to c45

CI 45 SC 45.2.1.4 P 23 L 12 # 1571
 Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks

Comment Type E Comment Status D

The new row in this table (45-6) relating to bit 1.4.7 should be shown with underline font
 because it is to be added.

SuggestedRemedy

Show additional row for bit 1.4.7 with underline font.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 Moved to c45

CI 45 SC 45.2.1.4 P 23 L 25 # 2268
 Hajduczenia, Marek Nokia Siemens Networ

Comment Type E Comment Status D

Line 27 is also affected.
 "1Gb/s" is missing a space - change to "1 Gb/s"

SuggestedRemedy

"1Gb/s" is missing a space - change to "1 Gb/s". Change also in line 27

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 45 SC 45.2.1.6 P 24 L 5 # 1635
 Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

In the Bit(s) column of the second row of Table 45-7 "1.7.15:3" should be "1.7.15:5"

SuggestedRemedy

Change to "1.7.15:5"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 Moved to c45
 Was "ER" changed to "TR"

Cl 45 **SC 45.2.1.6** **P 24** **L 8** # 1572
 Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks

Comment Type E **Comment Status D**
 The added text "1 1 0 1 0 = 10GBASE-PR-U3" in Table 45-7 should be shown with an underline font.

SuggestedRemedy
 Show "1 1 0 1 0 = 10GBASE-PR-U3" in underline font

Proposed Response **Response Status W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 Moved to c45

Cl 45 **SC 45.2.1.88** **P 28** **L 19** # 2269
 Hajduczenia, Marek Nokia Siemens Networ

Comment Type T **Comment Status D**
 Subclauses 45.2.1.88.1 and 45.2.1.88.2 do not follow the structure of the remainder of definitions in subclause 45.2.1 i.e. definitions start from 1.176.0 while should start from 1.176.1 to keep consistency with the other subclauses.

SuggestedRemedy
 Change current subclause 45.2.88.1 to 45.2.88.2 (register 1.176.1)
 Change current subclause 45.2.88.2 to 45.2.88.1 (register 1.176.0)

Proposed Response **Response Status W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 Changed from "E" to "T"

Cl 45 **SC 45.2.1.88.2** **P 28** **L 28** # 1638
 Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks

Comment Type ER **Comment Status D** *FEC registers*
 subclause 45.2.1.88.2 states that "10GBASE-PR FEC error indication is controlled by the FEC enable error indication bit in the FEC control register (see @@Subclause 45.2.1.85.2@@)". This is in contradiction to subclause 45.2.89.1 which states that it is register 1.177.0

SuggestedRemedy
 change the last sentence of 45.2.1.88.2 to be "10GBASE-PR FEC error indication is controlled by the FEC enable error indication bit in the FEC control register (see Subclause 45.2.1.89.1)".

Proposed Response **Response Status W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Moved to c45
 See resolution to comment 2272

Cl 45 **SC 45.2.1.89.2** **P 28** **L 49** # 181561
 Lynskey, Eric Teknovus

Comment Type T **Comment Status D** *resubmit references*
 The two references in this subclause need to be updated.

SuggestedRemedy
 Replace 45.3.2.84.2 with 45.2.1.88.2.
 Replace 74.8.3 with 76.2.3.3.

Proposed Response **Response Status W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 See resolution to comment 2272

== Resolution from Denver 0806 Meeting ==
 REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter. To be resubmitted by TF Chair against next draft

Replace 45.2.1.84.2 with active link to 45.2.1.88.2
 Replace 74.8.3 with active link to 76.2.3.3

=====

Cl 45 **SC 45.2.1.90** **P 29** **L** # 1979
 Dawe, Piers Avago

Comment Type TR **Comment Status D** *BA registers*
 Description of reading a pair of registers, different to the other pair of registers forming a counter.

SuggestedRemedy
 See text in 54.2 "In the case of two registers that together form a 32-bit counter...". Unless you have a strong reason to be different, refer to that, swap the two registers, and mark the registers "MW = Multi-word". See 45.2.6.12 10P/2B TPS-TC coding violations counter (Registers 6.25, 6.26) for an (the?) example. I've made this a TR to encourage you to agree what to do with the working group chair or his delegate, not because I think this is the only possible remedy. Liaise with P802.3ba.

Proposed Response **Response Status W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 See resolution to comment 2272

CI 45 SC 45.2.1.90 P 29 L 5 # 1978
 Dawe, Piers Avago

Comment Type T Comment Status D
 It's not PHY reset; MMDs can be reset independently

SuggestedRemedy
 Depending where the register ends up, PCS reset or whatever, or MMD reset.

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 See resolution to comment 2272

CI 45 SC 45.2.1.90 P 29 L 9 # 1573
 Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks

Comment Type E Comment Status D FEC counters text
 The last sentence of subclause 45.2.1.90 contains "reads of register 1.179 returns the latched value" This should be "reads of register 1.179 return the latched value"

SuggestedRemedy
 Change the last sentence of subclause 45.2.1.90 to end "reads of register 1.179 return the latched value rather than the current value of the counter."

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 Moved to c45

CI 45 SC 45.2.1.91 P 29 L 26 # 2103
 Kramer, Glen Teknovus, Inc.

Comment Type T Comment Status D
 Clause refers to an incorrect PHY

SuggestedRemedy
 10GBASE-R should be 10GBASE-PR

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 See resolution to comment 2272

CI 45 SC 45.2.1.91 P 29 L 32 # 1574
 Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks

Comment Type E Comment Status D FEC counters text
 The last sentence of subclause 45.2.1.91 contains "reads of register 1.181 returns the latched value" This should be "reads of register 1.181 return the latched value"

SuggestedRemedy
 Change the last sentence of subclause 45.2.1.91 to end "reads of register 1.181 return the latched value rather than the current value of the counter."

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 Moved to c45
 See resolution to comment 2272

CI 45 SC 45.2.188 P 28 L 4 # 2253
 Ganga, Ilango Intel

Comment Type ER Comment Status D
 Table 45-65 through 45-68 is already used in 802.3-2008 (.3ay/2.3) for WIS registers.

Hence use a dummy number (alpha numeric) for new tables (to avoid conflict with existing tables) and provide renumbering instructions as appropriate.

SuggestedRemedy
 Per comment

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 See Resolution to comment 2160 and 2272

CI 45 SC 45.2.3 P 30 L 10 # 1639
 Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks

Comment Type ER Comment Status D
 The second to last row of the amended Table 45-82 contains "3.75 thgough 3.32 767". "thgough" should be "through"

SuggestedRemedy
 change the second to last row of Table 45-82 to have Register address "3.75 through 3.32 767"

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 Moved to c45

Cl 45 SC 45.2.3 P30 L20 # 2271
 Hajduczenia, Marek Nokia Siemens Networ

Comment Type E Comment Status D
 Missing space in row 8, for 0010 10/1Gb/s.
 Is "10/1Gb/s", should be "10/1 Gb/s".

SuggestedRemedy
 Is "10/1Gb/s", should be "10/1 Gb/s" (missing space)

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 45 SC 45.2.3 P30 L6 # 2254
 Ganga, Ilango Intel

Comment Type ER Comment Status D
 Provide table title with Table number for the PCS registers listed in this page.

SuggestedRemedy
 As per comment.

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Insert the following heading text to line 6: "Table 45-82-PCS registers". Insert the following heading text to line 16: "Table 45-83-PCS control 1 register bit definitions"

Cl 45 SC 45.2.3 P30 L8 # 1575
 Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks

Comment Type E Comment Status D
 The register name for address 3.74 is "10GBASE-PR and 10/1GBASE-PRX Clause 76 BER Monitor Control". Including the clause number in this name is a bad idea because future clause re-numbering would change the register name.

SuggestedRemedy
 change the register name for address 3.74 to "10GBASE-PR and 10/1GBASE-PRX BER Monitor Control".
 Also change the title of subclause 45.2.3.29 to "10GBASE-PR and 10/1GBASE-PRX BER Monitor Control register (Register 3.74)"

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 Moved to c45

Cl 45 SC 45.2.3.29 P30 L30 # 2104
 Kramer, Glen Teknovus, Inc.

Comment Type T Comment Status D
 subclause refers to incorrect PHY

SuggestedRemedy
 10GBASE-R should be 10GBASE-PR

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 See 1680

Cl 45 SC 45.2.3.29 P30 L32 # 181553
 Lynskey, Eric Teknovus

Comment Type E Comment Status D *resubmit references*
 Cross reference refers to subclause that doesn't exist.

SuggestedRemedy
 Replace with 76.2.3.4 and provide linked cross reference so it will update and be correct if subclause numbering changes.

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

== Resolution from Denver 0806 Meeting ==
 REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter. To be resubmitted by TF Chair against next draft

Replace with active link.

=====

CI 56 SC 56.1 P34 L19 # 1694
Lin, Rujian Shanghai Luster Terab

Comment Type E Comment Status D

In Subclause 56.1 Overview, Subclause 56.1.1 is absent.
Although the text in line 19 reads "Shown in Figure 56-1", Figure 56-1 is absent.

SuggestedRemedy

Add "Subclause 56.1.1 Ethernet in the First Mile Topology".
Add Figure 56-1--The Relationship between EFM and OSI Reference Model on Page 34.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.
Basically, this clause only shows differences from CI 56 of IEEE 802.3ay D2.2. So this clause does not have to show Subclause 56.1.1 and Fig.56-1.

CI 56 SC 56.1 P34 L19 # 2273
Hajduczenia, Marek Nokia Siemens Networ

Comment Type E Comment Status D

Is "1Gb/s", should be "1 Gb/s" (missing space)

SuggestedRemedy

Is "1Gb/s", should be "1 Gb/s" (missing space)

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 56 SC 56.1 P34 L20 # 2294
Hajduczenia, Marek Nokia Siemens Networ

Comment Type E Comment Status D

Spelling error. Is "Figure", should be "Figure"

See#1576

SuggestedRemedy

Spelling error. Is "Figure", should be "Figure"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 56 SC 56.1 P34 L20 # 1993
Brown, Alan Wave7 Optics, Inc.

Comment Type E Comment Status D

Correctly spell "Figure".

See#1576

SuggestedRemedy

Correctly spell "Figure".

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 56 SC 56.1 P34 L20 # 1576
Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks

Comment Type E Comment Status D

"Figure 56-4" should be "Figure 56-4"

See#1576

SuggestedRemedy

change "Figure 56-4" to "Figure 56-4"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.
Moved to c56

CI 56 SC 56.1 P34 L20 # 1749
LANDRY, MATTHEW SILICON LABS

Comment Type E Comment Status D

"Figure" misspelled.

See#1576

SuggestedRemedy

Replace "Figure" with "Figure"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 56 SC 56.1 P34 L20 # 1666
Marris, Arthur Cadence

Comment Type E Comment Status D

Spelling 'Figure'

See#1576

SuggestedRemedy

Figure

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 56 SC 56.1 P34 L28 # 1577
Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks

Comment Type E Comment Status D

The third paragraph starts "EFM architecture is extended in Clause 75 ..." This would be better as "The EFM architecture is extended in Clause 75 ..."

SuggestedRemedy

Change the start of the third paragraph from "EFM architecture is extended in Clause 75 ..." to "The EFM architecture is extended in Clause 75 ..."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.
Moved to c56

Cl 56 SC 56.1 P34 L 32 # 1578
 Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks

Comment Type E Comment Status D

The third paragraph ends "while symmetric 10 Gb/s and asymmetric EPONs are referred to as 10G-EPON." This would be better as "while the symmetric 10 Gb/s and asymmetric EPONs are referred to as 10G-EPON."

SuggestedRemedy

Change the end of the third paragraph from "while symmetric 10 Gb/s and asymmetric EPONs are referred to as 10G-EPON." to "while the symmetric 10 Gb/s and asymmetric EPONs are referred to as 10G-EPON."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 Moved to c56

Cl 56 SC 56.1 P35 L 2 # 1983
 Dawe, Piers Avago

Comment Type ER Comment Status D

Font too small. Should be 8 point where space allows: see style guide. You've got the space here and the text will get shorter when you use lower case appropriately

SuggestedRemedy

Change all the 7 point text to 8 point in this and similar figures, also 76-8 and similar.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 56 SC 56.1.2 P38 L 10 # 1984
 Dawe, Piers Avago

Comment Type T Comment Status D See#1640

Claiming that there are "two systems" is too phoney. Apart from the several budget options, there are obviously three. Editorial and other corrections and (IMHO) improvements.

SuggestedRemedy

For P2MP optical fiber topologies, EFM defines three EPON families: a) 1G-EPON with a nominal bit rate of 1 Gb/s, shared amongst the population of Optical Network Units (ONUs) attached to the P2MP topology. The 1 Gb/s P2MP PHYs use the 1000BASE-X Physical Coding Sublayer (PCS) of 36.2 and 65.2.2, the Physical Medium Attachment (PMA) sublayer of 36.3 and 65.3, and an optional forward error correction (FEC) function defined in 65.2.3; b) 10G-EPON with a nominal bit rate of 10 Gb/s. The 10 Gb/s P2MP PHYs use the PCS of Clause 66 and 76.2, including a mandatory FEC function and the PMA of Clause 51 and 76.3; c) 10/1G-EPON with a nominal bit rate of 10 Gb/s in the downstream direction and 1 Gb/s upstream, using a combination of the sublayers for 1G-EPON and 10G-EPON.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 See #1640

Cl 56 SC 56.1.2 P38 L 11 # 1750
 LANDRY, MATTHEW SILICON LABS

Comment Type E Comment Status D See #1640

There appears to be some error in wording or simply confusion on my part: "PON with a symmetric, EFM supports a nominal bit rate of 1000 Mb1 Gb/s ..."

The first clause seems incomplete. The Mb-Gb part seems muddled.

SuggestedRemedy

If the wording is correct and I am just misunderstanding, do nothing. If not, correct as appropriate.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 See comment #1640

Cl 56 SC 56.1.2 P38 L 11 # 1802
 Flatman, Alan LAN Technologies
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **D** See#1640
 This sentence does not make sense.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Improve wording to make sense.
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 See #1640

Cl 56 SC 56.1.2 P38 L 11 # 2422
 DIAB, WAEL BROADCOM
 Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **D** See#1640
 1000 Mb1 Gb/s is incorrect
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change to 1000 Mb/s,
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 See #1640

Cl 56 SC 56.1.2 P38 L 11 # 2015
 Frazier, Howard Broadcom
 Comment Type **ER** Comment Status **D** See#1640
 extraneous words "EFM supports a".
 SuggestedRemedy
 delete extraneous words "EFM supports a".
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 See #1640

Cl 56 SC 56.1.2 P38 L 12 # 2275
 Hajduczenia, Marek Nokia Siemens Networ
 Comment Type **ER** Comment Status **D** See#1640
 Incorrect text in the bullet a, reading "PON with a symmetric, EFM supports a nominal bit rate of 1000 Mb1 Gb/s.". Text needs to be changed as provided in the suggested remedy.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change "PON with a symmetric, EFM supports a nominal bit rate of 1000 Mb1 Gb/s, " to "PON with a symmetric, nominal bit rate of 1000 Mb/s, "
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 See #1640

Cl 56 SC 56.1.2 P38 L 12 # 1762
 KIMURA, Mitsunobu Hitachi Communicatio
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **D** See#1640
 "bit rate of 1000Mb1 Gb/s" is wrongly typed.
 SuggestedRemedy
 "bit rate of 1 Gb/s"
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 See #1640

Cl 56 SC 56.1.2 P38 L 12 # 1681
 Jessica, Jiang Salira
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **D**
 typo "1000 Mb1 Gb/s"
 SuggestedRemedy
 remove "b1"
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 See #1640

Cl 56 SC 56.1.2 P38 L 12 # 1695
 Lin, Rujian Shanghai Luster Terab
Comment Type E Comment Status D See#1640
 PON with a symmetric, EFM supports a nominal bit rate of 1000 Mb/s,
SuggestedRemedy
 Corrected to "PON with a symmetric EFM supports a nominal bit rate of 1000 Mb/s",
Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 See #1640

Cl 56 SC 56.1.2 P38 L 14 # 2276
 Hajduczenia, Marek Nokia Siemens Networ
Comment Type E Comment Status D
 Double hyphen in the PMD name. Is "1000BASE--X", should be "1000BASE-X"
SuggestedRemedy
 Is "1000BASE--X", should be "1000BASE-X"
Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 56 SC 56.1.2 P38 L 15 # 1751
 LANDRY, MATTHEW SILICON LABS
Comment Type E Comment Status D See#2277
 Regarding "Clause 65@@Clause 60@@" I am not sure why the 'external' link does not match the 'local' reference. Further, why is there both a local reference and an external link?
 On line 16 there appear to be two local links, which both agree in number. And on line 21 there is only an external link. Line 48 has lopsided ampersand delimiters.
 I believe I understand wanting to mark external links with ampersands. I don't fully comprehend the unpredictable use of local links concurrent with external links, especially when they sometimes don't agree.
SuggestedRemedy
 Check links for proper reference, and eliminate unneeded links, either local or external.
Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 See comment #2277

Cl 56 SC 56.1.2 P38 L 15 # 2277
 Hajduczenia, Marek Nokia Siemens Networ
Comment Type ER Comment Status D See#2277
 Lines 15 through 17 are affected.
 Text "layer defined in Clause 65@@Clause 60@@", and an optional FEC Forward Error Correction (FEC) function defined in Clause 65.Clause 65;" contains several errors:
 - Doubled reference to Clause 65
 - Reference to Clause 65 and then 60.
 Change the indicated block of text as proposed in the suggested remedy.

SuggestedRemedy
 Suggest to change the text:
 "layer defined in Clause 65@@Clause 60@@", and an optional FEC Forward Error Correction (FEC) function defined in Clause 65.Clause 65;"
 to
 "layer defined in @@Clause 65@@, and an optional FEC Forward Error Correction (FEC) function defined in @@Clause 65@@;"
Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 56 SC 56.1.2 P38 L 1617 # 1696
 Lin, Rujian Shanghai Luster Terab
Comment Type E Comment Status D See#2277
 the Physical Medium Attachment(PMA) sublayer defined in Cause 65 @@Clause 60@@,
SuggestedRemedy
 Corrected to "the Physical Medium Attachment(PMA) sublayer defined in Cause 65 ,
Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 See comment #2277

Cl 56 SC 56.1.2 P38 L 17 # 1579
 Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks
Comment Type E Comment Status D
 section b) wording would be improved by changing "in downstream" to "downstream" twice and "an mandatory" to "a mandatory"
SuggestedRemedy
 In section b) change "in downstream" to "downstream" twice and "an mandatory" to "a mandatory"
Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 Moved to c56

Cl 56 SC 56.1.2 P38 L 20 # 1687
 Jessica, Jiang Salira

Comment Type ER Comment Status D See#2278

The sentence is not very clear on the following:
 1) PCS is not only 10GBASE-R
 2) mandatory FEC is applied only for 10Gbps data.

Suggest to rephrase the sentence.

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 See #2278

Cl 56 SC 56.1.2 P38 L 20 # 2278
 Hajduczenia, Marek Nokia Siemens Networ

Comment Type T Comment Status D See#2278

10G-EPON does not use 10GBASE-R PCS but defined its own PCS i.e. 10GBASE-PR.
 Change reference to "10GBASE-R" PCS to "10GBASE-PR" PCS

SuggestedRemedy

Change "use the 10GBASE-R PCS" to "use the 10GBASE-PR PCS defined in @@Clause 76@@".
 Make sure that the "@@Clause 76@@" is changed to a live cross reference link.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 56 SC 56.1.2 P38 L 21 # 2419
 DIAB, WAEL BROADCOM

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Under section (b) there is no mention of what PCS is used for the case of 1Gb/s upstream

SuggestedRemedy

Please add the reference and pointer to the appropriate clauses

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Change "The P2MP PHYs use the 10BASE-R PCS, "to "The P2MP PHYs for the symmetric 10G-EPON use the 10BASE-R PCS (see @@Clause 75@@ whereas the P2MP PHYs for the asymmetric 10G-EPON use the 10BASE-R PCS for the downstream direction (see @@Clause 75@@) and 1000BASE-X PCS (see @@Clause 65) for the upstream direction."

Cl 56 SC 56.1.2 P38 L 21 # 1667
 Marris, Arthur Cadence

Comment Type E Comment Status D See#1579

Spelling 'an'

SuggestedRemedy

Replace 'an' with 'a'

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 56 SC 56.1.2 P38 L 46 # 2396
 Law, David 3Com

Comment Type T Comment Status D

A 'frame' or 'MAC frame' is from the Destination Address to Frame Check Sequence inclusive, a 'packet' or 'MAC packet' is a MAC frame plus Preamble, Start Frame Delimiter and Extension.

Based on this the LLID replaces the first two bytes of a packet.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the text 'It achieves this by prepending a Logical Link Identification (LLID) to the beginning of each data frame, replacing two octets of the preamble.' to read 'It achieves this by providing a Logical Link Identification (LLID) in each packet by replacing two octets of the preamble.'

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 56 SC 56.1.2 P41 L 14 # 2259
 Chalupsky, David Intel Corp.

Comment Type E Comment Status D See#1640

This sentence (which begins at line 14) is not clear "PON with a symmetric, EFM supports a nominal bit rate of 1000 Mb1 Gb/s, shared amongst the population of Optical Network Units (ONUs) attached to the P2MP topology."

SuggestedRemedy

Not sure what the intent was, but if I interpret this correctly, replace the first sentence (starting at line 14) with "PON with a symmetric nominal bit rate of 1 Gb/s, shared amongst the population of Optical Network Units (ONUs) attached to the P2MP topology."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 See #1640

Cl 56 SC 56.1.2.1 P38 L27 # 1697
 Lin, Rujian Shanghai Luster Terab

Comment Type E Comment Status D
 state diagrams,

SuggestedRemedy
 state diagrams

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 56 SC 56.1.2.1 P38 L28 # 2004
 Frazier, Howard Broadcom

Comment Type E Comment Status D
 "The issues related with coexistence..." s/b "The issues related to coexistence...".

SuggestedRemedy
 change as suggested.

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 56 SC 56.1.2.1 P38 L31 # 1698
 Lin, Rujian Shanghai Luster Terab

Comment Type E Comment Status D
 more ONUs

SuggestedRemedy
 more Optical Network Units(ONUs)

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED REJECT.
 That is already defined as ONUs. See Line 13 of Page 38.

Cl 56 SC 56.1.2.1 P38 L32 # 2279
 Hajduczenia, Marek Nokia Siemens Networ

Comment Type E Comment Status D
 Text refers to Figure 56-2 only, while Figure 56-3 and 56-4 were added. Text "Every P2MP topology consists of one Optical Line Terminal (OLT) plus one or more ONUs, as shown in Figure 56-2." needs an update, as suggested in the remedy.

SuggestedRemedy
 Change
 "Every P2MP topology consists of one Optical Line Terminal (OLT) plus one or more ONUs, as shown in Figure 56-2."
 to
 "Every P2MP topology consists of one Optical Line Terminal (OLT) plus one or more ONUs, as shown in Figure 56-2, Figure 56-3 and Figure 56-4, for EPON, symmetric 10G-EPON and asymmetric 10G-EPON, respectively."
 Make sure that the links to Figures are live cross references.

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 56 SC 56.1.2.1 P38 L38 # 1699
 Lin, Rujian Shanghai Luster Terab

Comment Type E Comment Status D
 XGMII, are

SuggestedRemedy
 XGMII are

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 56 SC 56.1.2.2 P38 L40 # 2280
 Hajduczenia, Marek Nokia Siemens Networ

Comment Type T Comment Status D
 Lines 40 and 41 are affected.
 Statement about extending 10GBASE-R PCS is not true, since 10G-EPON defines its own PCS. Text "while extensions to the Clause 46 RS for P2MP topologies are described in Clause 76" needs thus extensions as provided in the suggested remedy.

SuggestedRemedy
 Change
 "while extensions to the Clause 46 RS for P2MP topologies are described in Clause 76"
 to
 "while RS for 10G-EPON P2MP topologies is described in Clause 76"
 Make sure "Clause 76" is a live cross reference.

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 56 SC 56.1.3 P 39 L 10 # 1994
 Brown, Alan Wave7 Optics, Inc.
 Comment Type E Comment Status D See#1994
 List begins with "c)".
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change list to begin with "a)".
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 56 SC 56.1.3 P 39 L 1025 # 1701
 Lin, Rujian Shanghai Luster Terab
 Comment Type E Comment Status D See#1994
 c) d) e) f) g) h)
 SuggestedRemedy
 Re-order as a) b) c) d) e) f).
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 56 SC 56.1.3 P 39 L 16 # 2000
 Brown, Alan Wave7 Optics, Inc.
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D See#1702
 Third list item references incorrect power budget.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Correct "PR10 power budget" to "PR30 power budget".
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 56 SC 56.1.3 P 39 L 16 # 2023
 Frazier, Howard Broadcom
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D See#1702
 "PR10 power budget" s/b "PR30 power budget"
 SuggestedRemedy
 change as suggested
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 56 SC 56.1.3 P 39 L 16 # 2394
 Law, David 3Com
 Comment Type T Comment Status D See#1702
 Doesn't the combination of a 10GBASE-PR-D3 PHY and a 10GBASE-PR-U3 PHY produce a PR30 power budget, similarly doesn't the combination of a 10/1GBASE-PRX-D3 PHY and a 10/1GBASE-PRX-U3 PHY produce a PRX30 power budget.
 SuggestedRemedy
 On line 16 change '.. PR10 power budget ..' to read '.. PR30 power budget ..'.
 On line 25 change '.. PRX10 power budget ..' to read '.. PRX30 power budget ..'.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 56 SC 56.1.3 P 39 L 16 # 1702
 Lin, Rujian Shanghai Luster Terab
 Comment Type E Comment Status D See#1702
 10GBASE-PR-D3 and 10GBASE-PR-U3, creating a PR-10 power budget,
 SuggestedRemedy
 Corrected to "10GBASE-PR-D3 and 10GBASE-PR-U3, creating a PR-30 power budget",
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 56 SC 56.1.3 P 39 L 19 # 1682
 Jessica, Jiang Salira
 Comment Type E Comment Status D
 typo "10/1GBASE-PR-U1" should be "10/1GBASE-PRX-U1"
 SuggestedRemedy
 change "10/1GBASE-PR-U1" to "10/1GBASE-PRX-U1"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 56 **SC 56.1.3** **P 39** **L 2** # 1712
 Lin, Rujian Shanghai Luster Terab

Comment Type **E** **Comment Status** **D**
 There is no sentence describing Table 56-1

SuggestedRemedy
 Add one sentence to describe Table 56-1

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**
 PROPOSED REJECT.
 Basically, this clause only shows differences from Cl 56 of IEEE 802.3ay D2.2. This clause does not show description about Table 56-1 because it has no changes. See comment #1694 as well.

Cl 56 **SC 56.1.3** **P 39** **L 22** # 2001
 Brown, Alan Wave7 Optics, Inc.

Comment Type **ER** **Comment Status** **D** See#1643
 Fifth list item references incorrect PMD.

SuggestedRemedy
 Correct "10/1GBASE-PRX-U1" to "10/1GBASE-PRX-U2".

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 56 **SC 56.1.3** **P 39** **L 22** # 1643
 Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks

Comment Type **ER** **Comment Status** **D** See#1643
 item g) starts "10/1GBASE-PRX-D2 and 10/1GBASE-PRX-U1," this should be "10/1GBASE-PRX-D2 and 10/1GBASE-PRX-U2,"

SuggestedRemedy
 in item g) change "10/1GBASE-PRX-D2 and 10/1GBASE-PRX-U1," to "10/1GBASE-PRX-D2 and 10/1GBASE-PRX-U2,"

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 Moved to c56

Cl 56 **SC 56.1.3** **P 39** **L 22** # 1703
 Lin, Rujian Shanghai Luster Terab

Comment Type **E** **Comment Status** **D** See#1643
 10/1GBASE-PRX-D2 and 10/1GBASE-PRX-U1, creating a PRX20 power budget,

SuggestedRemedy
 Corrected as "10/1GBASE-PRX-D2 and 10/1GBASE-PRX-U2, creating a PRX20 power budget",

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 56 **SC 56.1.3** **P 39** **L 22** # 1683
 Jessica, Jiang Salira

Comment Type **E** **Comment Status** **D** See#1643
 typo "10/1GBASE-PRX-U1" should be "10/1GBASE-PRX-U2"

SuggestedRemedy
 change "10/1GBASE-PRX-U1" to "10/1GBASE-PRX-U2"

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 56 **SC 56.1.3** **P 39** **L 25** # 1704
 Lin, Rujian Shanghai Luster Terab

Comment Type **E** **Comment Status** **D**
 10/1GBASE-PRX-D3 and 10/1GBASE-PRX-U3, creating a PRX10 power budget,

SuggestedRemedy
 Corrected as "10/1GBASE-PRX-D3 and 10/1GBASE-PRX-U3, creating a PRX30 power budget",

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 56 **SC 56.1.3** **P 39** **L 25** # 2024
 Frazier, Howard Broadcom

Comment Type **TR** **Comment Status** **D**
 "PRX10 power budget" s/b "PRX30 power budget"

SuggestedRemedy
 change as suggested

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 56 SC 56.1.3 P 39 L 29 # 2393
 Law, David 3Com

Comment Type T Comment Status D See#2393

The text about associated PMDs should be included before the list, in addition this subclause is discussion Physical layer signaling systems, not just PMDs, so that should be reflected in the introduction to the lettered list.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the text:

'.. FEC capability, as defined in @@Clause 76@. The family of P2MP Physical Layer signaling systems includes the following series of PMD combinations:'

to read:

'.. FEC capability, as defined in @@Clause 76@. All of these systems employ the PMD defined in Clause 75. This family of P2MP Physical Layer signaling systems includes the following series of PHY combinations:'.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change the"Additionally, EFM PMD combinations:" to "Additionally, EFM introduces a family of Physical Layer signaling systems which are derived from 10GBASE-R, but which include new 10GBASE-PR RS, PCS and PMA, along with a mandatory FEC capability, as defined in @@Clause 76@. All of these systems employ the PMD defined in Clause 75. The family of P2MP Physical Layer signaling systems utilizes 10GBASE-R signaling for the downstream direction while supporting both 10GBASE-R and 1000BASE-X upstream signaling in the following series of PHY combinations:"

Cl 56 SC 56.1.3 P 39 L 5 # 2261
 Chalupsky, David Intel Corp.

Comment Type E Comment Status D See#2393

incomplete description: the sentence "Additionally, EFM introduces a family of Physical Layer signaling systems which are derived from 10GBASE-R, but which include extensions to the RS, PCS and PMA, along with a mandatory FEC capability, as defined in @@Clause 76@." omits the fact that the upstream data in the PRX types use 1000BASE-X.

SuggestedRemedy

replace sentence with "Additionally, EFM introduces a family of Physical Layer signaling systems which are derived from 10GBASE-R and 1000BASE-X, but which include extensions to the RS, PCS and PMA, along with a mandatory FEC capability, as defined in @@Clause 76@.".

Or place the 1Gb reference in the following sentence:

"Additionally, EFM introduces a family of Physical Layer signaling systems which are derived from 10GBASE-R, but which include extensions to the RS, PCS and PMA, along with a mandatory FEC capability, as defined in @@Clause 76@. The family of P2MP Physical Layer signaling systems utilizes 10GBASE-R signalling for the downstream direction while supporting both 10GBASE-R and 1000BASE-X upstream signalling in the following series of PMD combinations:"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 See #2393

Cl 56 SC 56.1.3 P 39 L 6 # 2281
 Hajduczenia, Marek Nokia Siemens Networ

Comment Type T Comment Status D See #2393

Lines 6 - 7 are affected.

Statement about extending 10GBASE-R RS, PCS and PMA is not true since 10G-EPON defines its own PCS and RS. Text "which are derived from 10GBASE-R, but which include extensions to the RS, PCS and PMA, along with a mandatory FEC capability, as defined in @@Clause 76@" needs thus extensions as provided in the suggested remedy.

SuggestedRemedy

Change

"which are derived from 10GBASE-R, but which include extensions to the RS, PCS and PMA, along with a mandatory FEC capability, as defined in @@Clause 76@"
 to

"which are derived from 10GBASE-R, but include new 10GBASE-PR RS, PCS and PMA, featuring a mandatory FEC capability, as defined in @@Clause 76@"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 See #2393

CI 56 SC 56.1.3 P 40 L # 2421
DIAB, WAEL BROADCOM

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

The replacement of Table 56-1 is missing the Cu PMDs. In 802,3-2005 those appear on the next page a continued table, perhaps that is why they were missed.

SuggestedRemedy

Please add the 4 Cu PMDs back

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Add 10PASS-TS-O, 10PASS-TS-R, 2BASE-TL-O and 2BASE-TL-R back at end of table.

CI 56 SC 56.1.3 P 40 L 23 # 1753
Hirth, Ryan Teknovus

Comment Type E Comment Status D See#1753

The rates for the 10/1GBASE-PRX PHYs are reversed. A "D" type PHY operates at 10Gbps and a "U" type PHY operates at 1Gbps.

SuggestedRemedy

Swap 1000Mb/s with 10Gb/s for PRX-D1 - D3.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Basically, PRX-D type interfaces for OLTs transmit 10 Gb/s downstream signals and receive 1 Gb/s upstream signals. "Rate" for PRX-D type interfaces will be changed to 10 Gb/s downstream and 1000 Mb/s upstream. PRX-U type interfaces for ONUs receive 10 Gb/s downstream signals and transmit 1 Gb/s upstream signals. "Rate" for PRX-U type interfaces will be changed to 10 Gb/s downstream and 1000 Mb/s upstream.

CI 56 SC 56.1.3 P 40 L 25 # 1706
Lin, Rujian Shanghai Luster Terab

Comment Type T Comment Status D See#1753

10/1GBASE-PRX-U1 ONU 10 Gb/s

SuggestedRemedy

Correction: 10/1GBASE-PRX-U1 ONU 1000 Mb/s

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 56 SC 56.1.3 P 40 L 26 # 1707
Lin, Rujian Shanghai Luster Terab

Comment Type T Comment Status D See#1753

10/1GBASE-PRX-D2 OLT 1000 Mb/s

SuggestedRemedy

10/1GBASE-PRX-D2 OLT 10 Gb/s

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 56 SC 56.1.3 P 40 L 28 # 1708
Lin, Rujian Shanghai Luster Terab

Comment Type T Comment Status D See#1753

10/1GBASE-PRX-U2 ONU 10 Gb/s

SuggestedRemedy

Correction: 10/1GBASE-PRX-U2 ONU 1000 Mb/s

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
See comment #1753

CI 56 SC 56.1.3 P 40 L 29 # 1709
Lin, Rujian Shanghai Luster Terab

Comment Type T Comment Status D See#1753

10/1GBASE-PRX-D3 OLT 1000 Mb/s

SuggestedRemedy

Correction: 10/1GBASE-PRX-D3 OLT 10 Gb/s

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
See comment #1753

CI 56 SC 56.1.3 P 40 L 32 # 1684
Jessica, Jiang Salira

Comment Type E Comment Status D See#2105

in the column of Name, "10/1GBASE-PRX-U4" does not exist

SuggestedRemedy

change to "10/1GBASE-PRX-U3"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 56 SC 56.1.3 P 40 L 32 # 1644
 Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks

Comment Type ER Comment Status D

Row 17 (inc heading row) of Table 56-1 has a Name value of "10/1GBASE-PRX-U4" this should be "10/1GBASE-PRX-U3"

SuggestedRemedy

In row 17 (inc heading row) of Table 56-1, change the Name value from "10/1GBASE-PRX-U4" to "10/1GBASE-PRX-U3" (also fix the height of the row above)

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 Moved to c56

CI 56 SC 56.1.3 P 40 L 32 # 1710
 Lin, Rujian Shanghai Luster Terab

Comment Type T Comment Status D

10/1GBASE-PRX-U4 ONU 10 Gb/s

SuggestedRemedy

Correction: 10/1GBASE-PRX-U3 ONU 1000 Mb/s

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 56 SC 56.1.3 P 40 L 32 # 1754
 Hirth, Ryan Teknovus

Comment Type E Comment Status D

10/1GBASE-PRX-U4 should be 10/1GBASE-PRX-U3

SuggestedRemedy

change "U4" to "U3"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 56 SC 56.1.3 P 40 L 41 # 1646
 Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks

Comment Type ER Comment Status D See#2107

Table 56-1 before ammendment by 802.3av contained four rows that are not shown in this draft revision. Since the editing instruction is "Change Table 56-1 as below", this implies deleting the four rows not shown.

SuggestedRemedy

show the four extra rows in the current Table 56-1 in normal font including notes b to f

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 Moved to c56
 See comment #2107

CI 56 SC 56.1.3 P 40 L 43 # 2391
 Law, David 3Com

Comment Type T Comment Status D See#2107

The change instructions and this table could be misread as meaning that the rows for 10PASS-TS and 10BASE-TL (see IEEE Std 802.3-2005 page 5) which is not correct.

SuggestedRemedy

Make it clear these rows are not to be deleted.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 See #2107

CI 56 SC 56.1.3 P 40 L 46 # 1647
 Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks

Comment Type ER Comment Status D

The text below Table 56-1 starts "Table 56 specifies the correlation between nomenclature and clauses for P2P systems, while Table 56-3specifies ...". The first Table should be 56-2 and there is a space missing between "Table 56-3" and "specifies"

SuggestedRemedy

Change the text below Table 56-1 to start "Table 56-2 specifies the correlation between nomenclature and clauses for P2P systems, while Table 56-3 specifies ...".

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 Moved to c56

Cl 56 SC 56.1.3 P 40 L 46 # 2282
Hajduczenia, Marek Nokia Siemens Networ

Comment Type ER Comment Status D See#2106

Reference to Table 56 is unclear. Change line 40 as suggested in remedy field.
Missing space in line 47 after "Table 56-3"

SuggestedRemedy

Change "Table 56 specifies the correlation" to "Table 56-2 specifies the correlation". Make sure link to "Table 56-2" is a live cross-reference.
Change "while Table 56-3specifies " to "while Table 56-3 specifies ". Make sure link to "Table 56-3" is a live cross-reference.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.
See #2106

Cl 56 SC 56.1.3 P 40 L 46 # 1763
KIMURA, Mitsunobu Hitachi Communicatio

Comment Type E Comment Status D See#2006

"while Table 56-3specifies" needs a space.

SuggestedRemedy

"while Table 56-3 specifies"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 56 SC 56.1.3 P 40 L 46 # 2106
Kramer, Glen Teknovus, Inc.

Comment Type T Comment Status D See#2106

"Table 56 specifies the correlation between nomenclature and clauses for P2P systems, while Table 56-3 specifies the correlation between nomenclature and clauses for P2MP systems."

There is no table 56

SuggestedRemedy

Use "Table 56-2 specifies the correlation between nomenclature and clauses for P2P systems, while Table 56-3 specifies the correlation between nomenclature and clauses for P2MP systems."

Insert space after 56-3

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 56 SC 56.1.3 P 40 L 46 # 1713
Lin, Rujian Shanghai Luster Terab

Comment Type E Comment Status D

Table 56 specifies.....

SuggestedRemedy

Table 56-2 specifies.....

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 56 SC 56.1.3 P 40 L 47 # 2165
Bennett, Michael LBNL

Comment Type E Comment Status D

Table 56-3specifies ... needs a space inserted between the "3" and "s"

SuggestedRemedy

replace with the following text

Table 56-3 specifies

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 56 SC 56.1.3 P 40 L 47 # 2006
Frazier, Howard Broadcom

Comment Type E Comment Status D See#2006

missing space in "Table 56-3specifies".

SuggestedRemedy

insert a space

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 56 SC 56.1.3 P 42 L # 2423
DIAB, WAEL BROADCOM

Comment Type TR Comment Status D See#2283

Tale 56-3 has incorrect PMD names for 10GBASE PMDs

SuggestedRemedy

Change PX to PR

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
See #2283

Cl 56 SC 56.1.3 P 42 L 1 # 1580
 Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks
 Comment Type E Comment Status D
 Editing instruction starts with a dot
 SuggestedRemedy
 Remove leading dot so ".Insert" becomes "Insert"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 Moved to c56

Cl 56 SC 56.1.3 P 42 L 10 # 2364
 Law, David 3Com
 Comment Type E Comment Status D
 Add PMD to the end of the header text in all the columns from 10/1GBASE-PRX-D1 through to 10GBASE-PR-U3.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change '10/1GBASE-PRX-D1' to read '10/1GBASE-PRX-D1 PMD'.
 Add 'PMD' to end of all other column headings.
 To '10GBASE-PR-U3' to read '10GBASE-PR-U3 PMD'.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 56 SC 56.1.3 P 42 L 10 # 1756
 Hirth, Ryan Teknovus
 Comment Type E Comment Status D See#2415
 in column 77 "10G-EPN P2MP MPMCS" should read "10G-EP0N P2MP MPMC"
 SuggestedRemedy
 change "10G-EPN P2MP MPMCS" to "10G-EP0N P2MP MPMC"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 56 SC 56.1.3 P 42 L 11 # 1996
 Brown, Alan Wave7 Optics, Inc.
 Comment Type E Comment Status D
 Missing comma.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add comma as in "PMA, FEC".
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 56 SC 56.1.3 P 42 L 15 # 1764
 KIMURA, Mitsunobu Hitachi Communicatio
 Comment Type E Comment Status D See#2006
 "10G-EPN" is not defined abbreviation.
 SuggestedRemedy
 "10G-EPON"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 56 SC 56.1.3 P 42 L 31 # 1755
 Hirth, Ryan Teknovus
 Comment Type E Comment Status D See#2283
 10GBASE-PX PHYs in table should read 10GBASE-PR.
 SuggestedRemedy
 change 10GBASE-PX-D1 to 10GBASE-PR-D1.
 change 10GBASE-PX-D2 to 10GBASE-PR-D2.
 change 10GBASE-PX-D3 to 10GBASE-PR-D3.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 See comment #2283

Cl 56 SC 56.1.3 P 42 L 32 # 1648
 Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D See#2283
 In Table 56-3 there are rows for "10GBASE-PX-D1", "10GBASE-PX-D2" and "10GBASE-PX-D3" which should be "10GBASE-PR-D1", "10GBASE-PR-D2" and "10GBASE-PR-D3"
 SuggestedRemedy
 In Table 56-3 change "10GBASE-PX-D1", "10GBASE-PX-D2" and "10GBASE-PX-D3" to "10GBASE-PR-D1", "10GBASE-PR-D2" and "10GBASE-PR-D3"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Moved to c56
 See comment #2283

Cl 56 **SC 56.1.3** **P 42** **L 36** # 1649
 Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks

Comment Type **ER** **Comment Status** **D** *See#2283*

In Table 56-3 there is a row for "10GBASE-PR-U2" which does not exist.

SuggestedRemedy
 Remove the row for "10GBASE-PR-U2"

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Moved to c56
 See comment #2283

Cl 56 **SC 56.1.3** **P 42** **L 38** # 1686
 Jessica, Jiang Salira

Comment Type **E** **Comment Status** **D** *See#2283*

In table 56-3,
 1) in nameenclature column, 10GBASE-PX-D1,2,3 should be 10GBASE-PR-D1,2,3
 2) 10GBASE-PR-U2 does not exist
 3) the last two rows, the "M"s also need to be modified.

SuggestedRemedy
 1) change "10GBASE-PX-D1,2,3" to "10GBASE-PR-D1,2,3"
 2) delete the row of "10GBASE-PR-U2", i.e., the 3rd row from the bottom
 3) adjust the middle "M" for the last two rows.

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 See comment #2283

Cl 56 **SC Table 56-3** **P 42** **L** # 2415
 DIAB, WAEL BROADCOM

Comment Type **E** **Comment Status** **D** *See#2415*

EPON is not spelled correctly in the last column

SuggestedRemedy
 Please fix spelling

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 66 **SC 4.2.1** **P 44** **L 40** # 2173
 Woodward, Ted Telcordia Technologie

Comment Type **E** **Comment Status** **D**

first paragraph of 66.4.2.1 appears as though it should be formatted as an editorial remark

SuggestedRemedy
 reformat this paragraph

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.
 Note to the commentor that the full subclause should be placed in the comment tool. This paragraph is consistent with other subclauses of Clause 66.

Cl 66 **SC 4.2.3** **P NA** **L 20** # 2187
 Woodward, Ted Telcordia Technologie

Comment Type **T** **Comment Status** **D** *Duplicate 1663*

The behavior in case '(b)' of this section is inconsistent with that described in 66.4.2.1. There also seems to be an editorial error -- the phrase 'idle control characters' seems like it should be deleted to make the inserted text sensible. If this is done, case (c) on line 27 is now consistent with case (b), but remains inconsistent with 66.4.2.1.

SuggestedRemedy
 Clarify case (b), and harmonize this section with 66.4.2.1. It seems like this section is the correct one with the edit suggested above. Also consider a diagram indicating desired behavior for local / remote fault in the uni-directional and bi-directional case.

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 See response to comment 1663.

Cl 66 **SC 66.3.1** **P 44** **L 17** # 1668
 Marris, Arthur Cadence

Comment Type **E** **Comment Status** **D**

Spelling insertign

SuggestedRemedy
 inserting

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 66 SC 66.3.1 P 44 L 18 # 1581
 Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Duplicate 1668
 Editing instruction contains word "insertign" which should be "inserting"
 SuggestedRemedy
 change "insertign" to "inserting"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 Moved to c66
 See response to comment 1668.

Cl 66 SC 66.4.2.1 P 44 L 31 # 1669
 Marris, Arthur Cadence
 Comment Type T Comment Status D Duplicate 1663
 It is not clear what is being changed in 802.3av. It seems that idle is now sent instead of remote fault on local fault which does not seem right.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Redraft this subclause so it is understandable.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 See response to comment 1663.

Cl 66 SC 66.4.2.1 P 44 L 45 # 1582
 Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks
 Comment Type E Comment Status D
 The text says "The nature of the P2MP allows for some of these fault conditions to be ignored."
 This would read better as:
 "The nature of the P2MP link allows for some of these fault conditions to be ignored."
 SuggestedRemedy
 change "The nature of the P2MP allows" to "The nature of the P2MP link allows"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 Moved to c66

Cl 66 SC 66.4.2.3 P 45 L 21 # 1987
 Dawe, Piers Avago
 Comment Type T Comment Status D Duplicate 1663
 "RS shall continuously generate Idle control characters Remote Fault Sequence ordered_sets."
 SuggestedRemedy
 Which is it? Idles or RF?
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 See response to comment 1663.

Cl 66 SC 66.4.2.3 P 45 L 21 # 2025
 Frazier, Howard Broadcom
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D Duplicate 1663
 The words "Remote Fault Sequence ordered_sets" should appear with strikethroughs.
 SuggestedRemedy
 strikethrough the offending words
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 See response to comment 1663.

Cl 66 SC 66.4.2.3 P 45 L 21 # 1670
 Marris, Arthur Cadence
 Comment Type T Comment Status D Duplicate 1663
 b) Idle control characters not under-lined. Remote fault not struck through.
 SuggestedRemedy
 As above
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 See response to comment 1663.

CI 66 SC 66.4.2.3 P 45 L 27 # 1583
 Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks
 Comment Type E Comment Status D
 option c) starts:
 "llink_fault = Remote Fault
 If unidirectional_enable = FALSE,"
 but "If unidirectional_enable = FALSE," was not part of clause 46.3.4.3
 SuggestedRemedy
 show "If unidirectional_enable = FALSE," in underline font
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 Moved to c66

CI 66 SC 66.5 P 45 L 42 # 2284
 Hajduczenia, Marek Nokia Siemens Networ
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Duplicate 2071
 Incorrect speed designation in item XP2MP
 Is "10 Gp/s" should be "10 Gb/s"
 SuggestedRemedy
 Is "10 Gp/s" should be "10 Gb/s"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 66 SC 66.5 P 45 L 42 # 1803
 Flatman, Alan LAN Technologies
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Duplicate 2071
 Typo (operaiont)
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change to "operation".
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 66 SC 66.5 P 45 L 43 # 2071
 Kramer, Glen Teknovus, Inc.
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Duplicate 2071
 Typos
 "10 Gp/s P2MP operaiont"
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change
 1) Gp/s --> Gb/s
 2) operaiont --> operation
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 66 SC 66.5 P 45 L 43 # 2007
 Frazier, Howard Broadcom
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Duplicate 2071
 spelling mistake "operaiont" in "Feature" column.
 SuggestedRemedy
 ficks speling.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 66 SC 66.5.3 P 45 L 42 # 1584
 Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks
 Comment Type E Comment Status D
 The feature column contains "10 Gp/s P2MP operaiont" and the Subclause column
 contains "66"
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change feature to "10 Gb/s P2MP operation" change Subclause to "66.4"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 Moved to c66

Cl 66 SC 66.5.3 P 45 L 42 # 2260
 Chalupsky, David Intel Corp.
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Duplicate 2071
 typo "operaiont"
 SuggestedRemedy
 change to "operation"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 66 SC 66.5.4.5 P 46 L 6 # 2285
 Hajduczenia, Marek Nokia Siemens Networ
 Comment Type T Comment Status D
 Lines 6 - 7 are affected.
 In item PF2, reference is made to 10 Gb/s P2MP RS, which references to Clause 46. It is incorrect, since 10 Gb/s P2MP RS is a new RS, defined in Clause 76.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change Value/Comment for item PF1 to read "See Clause 76".
 Make sure link to "Clause 76" is a live cross-reference
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 67 SC 67 P 47 L 19 # 2072
 Kramer, Glen Teknovus, Inc.
 Comment Type E Comment Status D
 grammar
 SuggestedRemedy
 Insert "in" after "and"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 [Subclause was added]

Cl 75 SC 75 P 49 L 1 # 1927
 Dawe, Piers Avago
 Comment Type T Comment Status D
 Most multi-clause projects are ordered DOWN the layer stack: MAC then RS the PCS and so on. This draft orders the three or four sublayers in 76 from top down also.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Swap Clause 77 with Clause 75
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED REJECT.
 [Line number was fixed]
 Clause order was modelled after 1G EPON. In 802.3ayD2.2 clauses are ordered as follows:
 Clause 60: PMD
 Clause 64: MACC
 Clause 65: RS, PCS and PMA
 In 10GEAPON 802.3av, clauses are order as follows:
 Clause 75: PMD
 Clause 76: PCS, PMA and RS
 Clause 77: MACC
 Which seems to follow bottom - up logic.

Cl 75 SC 75.1 P 49 L 48 # 1587
 Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks
 Comment Type E Comment Status D
 The abbreviation EPON is not in the list of abbreviations
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add EPON to the list of abbreviations
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Add a new entry in C01/1.5 with the following contents "EPON Ethernet Passive Optical Networks". Align with the style used in C01/1.5.

CI 75 SC 75.1.1 P 49 L 48 # 2008
Frazier, Howard Broadcom

Comment Type E Comment Status D

This paragraph would benefit from a sprinkling of definite articles.

SuggestedRemedy

Rewrite paragraph as follows:

EPONs operate over a point-to-multipoint (P2MP) topology, also called a tree or trunk-and-branch topology. The device connected at the root of the tree is called an Optical Line Terminal (OLT) and the devices connected as the leaves are referred to as Optical network Units (ONUs). The direction of transmission from the OLT to the ONUs is referred to as the downstream direction, while the direction of transmission from the ONUs to the OLT is referred to as the upstream direction.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 75 SC 75.1.1 P 49 L 50 # 1765
KIMURA, Mitsunobu Hitachi Communicatio

Comment Type E Comment Status D

"Optical network Unit (ONU)" of "network" should be "Network".

SuggestedRemedy

"Optical Network Unit (ONU)"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.
[Subclause number was fixed]

CI 75 SC 75.1.4 P 50 L 37 # 2073
Kramer, Glen Teknovus, Inc.

Comment Type E Comment Status D

Align bullets in the bulleted list

bullets in 75.1.4

SuggestedRemedy

see above

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 75 SC 75.1.4 P 50 L 38 # 1585
Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks

Comment Type E Comment Status D bullets in 75.1.4

The bullets at the bottom of page 50 do not line up with each other suggesting that some are sub-bullets

SuggestedRemedy

Align the bullets

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.
See comment #2073

CI 75 SC 75.1.4 P 50 L 38 # 2286
Hajduczenia, Marek Nokia Siemens Networ

Comment Type E Comment Status D bullets in 75.1.4

Lines 38-47 are affected. The bullets are not aligned correctly - align them.

SuggestedRemedy

Align the individual bullets in lines 38-47.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.
See comment #2073

CI 75 SC 75.1.4 P 50 L 45 # 2026
Frazier, Howard Broadcom

Comment Type TR Comment Status D PR20 - PX20

"PX10" s/b "PX20".

SuggestedRemedy

change as suggested in comment.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.
See comment #1586

Cl 75 **SC 75.1.4** **P 50** **L 45** # 1714
 Lin, Rujian Shanghai Luster Terab

Comment Type **T** **Comment Status** **D** **PR20 - PX20**
 PX10 power budget

SuggestedRemedy
 Correction: PX20 power budget

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 [Changed from "E" to "T"]

Cl 75 **SC 75.1.4** **P 82** **L 1** # 2174
 Woodward, Ted Telcordia Technologie

Comment Type **T** **Comment Status** **D** **Fibre type standards**
 Table 75-1 does not reference what B.1.1 , B.1.3 Fiber types are.

SuggestedRemedy
 Add reference to ITU documents, as in Table 75-20, or perhaps reference Table 75-20.

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 [Changed from "E" to "T"]
 [Subclause number was fixed]
 [Page number was added]
 See comment #1805

Cl 75 **SC 75.10.3** **P 80** **L 44** # 1610
 Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks

Comment Type **E** **Comment Status** **D**
 The second paragraph starts: "Reference @@Annex 67A@@ for additional environmental information." which is unclear.

SuggestedRemedy
 Change to "See Annex 67A for additional environmental information."

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 Mark external reference as appropriate.

Cl 75 **SC 75.11.1** **P 81** **L 22** # 1934
 Dawe, Piers Avago

Comment Type **T** **Comment Status** **D** **ANSI/TIA/EIA-526-7**
 We should reference international standards where available. Is there is an ITU-T equivalent to ANSI/TIA/EIA-526-7 [B15], method A-1?

SuggestedRemedy
 If so, reference the ITU-T equivalent, add to 1.3 if not present, and if you are good citizens, change any other clauses that use this

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 See comment #1804

Cl 75 **SC 75.11.2** **P 82** **L 18** # 1657
 Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks

Comment Type **ER** **Comment Status** **D** **joint**
 Table 75-20 footnote c contains "calculated using spectral attenuation modelling method (5.4.4) included in G.650.1 (06/2004) and the matrix coefficients included in Appendix III herein" but the 802.3av draft does not contain an Appendix III

SuggestedRemedy
 change to "calculated using spectral attenuation modelling method (5.4.4) included in G.650.1 (06/2004) and the matrix coefficients included in Appendix III therein"

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 change to "calculated using spectral attenuation modelling method (5.4.4) included in ITU-T G.650.1 (06/2004) and the matrix coefficients included in Appendix III therein"
 Verify that all references to ITU-T G.xxx series recommendations in the whole draft include proper format i.e. "ITU-T G.xxx".

Cl 75 **SC 75.11.3** **P 82** **L 31** # 1658
 Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks

Comment Type **ER** **Comment Status** **D**
 Reference is made to "(G.671 am 1)" but G.671 is not in the references

SuggestedRemedy
 Add G.671 to the references

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Change the text from "(G.671 am 1)" to "(ITU-T G.671 am 1)"

Add a new normative reference in C01/1.3 with the following contents "ITU-T Recommendation G.671 am 1, 2006-Transmission characteristics of optical components and subsystems, Amendment 1"

Cl 75 SC 75.12.4 P 86 L 2 # 2080
 Kramer, Glen Teknovus, Inc.
 Comment Type E Comment Status D
 Page break in the middle of the title
 SuggestedRemedy
 Remove the page break.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 75 SC 75.12.4.1 P 87 L 19 # 1611
 Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks
 Comment Type E Comment Status D
 FN5 to FN8 are:
 FN5 Signal detect function
 FN6 Signal detect parameter
 FN7 Signal detect function
 FN7 Signal detect function
 FN8 Signal detect parameter
 1) these would be easier to understand if ONU and OLT were added
 2) FN7 appears twice
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change to:
 FN5 ONU signal detect function
 FN6 ONU signal detect parameter
 FN7 OLT signal detect function
 FN8 OLT signal detect function
 FN9 OLT signal detect parameter
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 75 SC 75.12.4.13 P 92 L 1 # 1935
 Dawe, Piers Avago
 Comment Type E Comment Status D
 Make PICS match clause
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change title to "Definitions of optical parameters and measurement methods"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 75 SC 75.12.4.13 P 92 L 6 # 1612
 Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks
 Comment Type E Comment Status D
 value/comment "2 m to 5 meters in length" is not consistent.
 SuggestedRemedy
 change to "2 m to 5 m in length"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 75 SC 75.12.4.15 P 93 L 25 # 1662
 Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks
 Comment Type T Comment Status D PICS IEC-60950
 value/comment is "Conform to Class 1 laser requirements defined in IEC 60825-1"
 This only refers to IEC 60825-1 (Safety of Laser Products-Part 1: Equipment classification and requirements.) and not to the much more relevant (and much easier to understand) IEC 60825-2 (Safety of laser products-Part 2: Safety of optical fibre communication systems OFCS)
 SuggestedRemedy
 change to "Conforms to Class 1 laser requirements defined in IEC 60825-1 and IEC 60825-2"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 75 SC 75.2 P 52 L 18 # 2389
 Law, David 3Com
 Comment Type T Comment Status D joint
 I believe that the OLT incorporates the MDI.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Show the OLT bracket reaching the Fibre (see Figure 56-2) - need to do this for all OTLs and ONUs figures.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 Applicable to all subclauses in D2.0 - revise figures and extend the brackets to fully incorporate MDI interface at the bottom of the stack

CI 75 **SC 75.2** **P 54** **L 26** # 2287
Hajduczenia, Marek Nokia Siemens Networ

Comment Type E **Comment Status D** 75.2.1 subclause

In line 26, there is reference to "Clause 75.2.1" in text "shown in Clause 75.2.1 below". It is incorrect - 75.2.1 is a Subclause.
The same is true for line 27 and the text "given in Clause 75.4 and". Change "given in Clause 75.4 and" to "given in Subclause 75.4 and"
The same is true for line 27 and the text "are presented in Clause 75.5"
Change "are presented in Clause 75.5" to "are presented in Subclause 75.5"

SuggestedRemedy
Change "shown in Clause 75.2.1 below" to "shown in Subclause 75.2.1 below"
Make sure that the link is live.
Change "given in Clause 75.4 and" to "given in Subclause 75.4 and"
Make sure that the link is live.
Change "are presented in Clause 75.5" to "are presented in Subclause 75.5"
Make sure that the link is live.

Proposed Response **Response Status W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Change "shown in Clause 75.2.1 below" to "shown in 75.2.1 below"
Make sure that the link is live.
Change "given in Clause 75.4 and" to "given in 75.4 and"
Make sure that the link is live.
Change "are presented in Clause 75.5" to "are presented in 75.5"
Make sure that the link is live.

CI 75 **SC 75.2** **P 54** **L 27** # 2357
Law, David 3Com

Comment Type E **Comment Status D** 75.2.1 subclause

75.2.1 is a subclause, not a Clause.

SuggestedRemedy
Change 'Clause' to 'subclause' in the following locations:

Page 54, line 27
Page 54, line 28 (twice)

Check for and correct other instances throughout the draft.

Proposed Response **Response Status W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
See comment #2287

CI 75 **SC 75.2.1** **P 54** **L 34** # 2358
Law, David 3Com

Comment Type E **Comment Status D** 75.2.1 subclause

75.2.1 is a subclause, not a section.

SuggestedRemedy
Change 'section' to 'subclause' in the following locations:

Page 54, line 35.
Page 60, line 3.
Page 64, line 3.

Check for and correct other instances throughout the draft.

Proposed Response **Response Status W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Remove the word 'section' in the following locations:
Page 54, line 35.
Page 60, line 3.
Page 64, line 3.

CI 75 **SC 75.2.1** **P 54** **L 34** # 2359
Law, David 3Com

Comment Type E **Comment Status D**

I believe these are termed 'power budget' elsewhere in the draft, not 'end-to-end power budget'.

SuggestedRemedy
Check the text 'The end-to-end power budget ..' to read 'The power budget ..'.

Proposed Response **Response Status W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 75 **SC 75.2.1.1** **P 54** **L 40** # 2074
Kramer, Glen Teknovus, Inc.

Comment Type E **Comment Status D**

Text should say "...to achieve the power budgets shown in Table 75-1".
(answers which power budget, not how to achieve them)

SuggestedRemedy
remove "as". Same on page 55, line 4.

Proposed Response **Response Status W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 75 **SC 75.3.1.1** **P 55** **L 45** # 1931
 Dawe, Piers Avago

Comment Type **T** **Comment Status** **D** **PMD delay bounds**
 "A description of the overall system delay constraints can be found in @@Subclause 77.3.2.4@@. It can't.

SuggestedRemedy
 Point somewhere else: not sure where. Delete "@@Subclause". Make the cross-references between the new clauses and remove those @@.

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 See comment #1929 for resolution.

Cl 75 **SC 75.3.1.1** **P 55** **L 46** # 2288
 Hajduczenia, Marek Nokia Siemens Networ

Comment Type **E** **Comment Status** **D**
 There is already a formalized way of denoting time_quanta. Text "constant receive delay of not more than 4 time-quanta" needs alignment.
 Change "constant receive delay of not more than 4 time-quanta" to "constant receive delay of not more than 4 time_quanta".

SuggestedRemedy
 Change "constant receive delay of not more than 4 time-quanta" to "constant receive delay of not more than 4 time_quanta".

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 75 **SC 75.3.1.4** **P 56** **L 25** # 2009
 Frazier, Howard Broadcom

Comment Type **E** **Comment Status** **D**
 missing "the" before "@@Clause 76@@ PCS"

SuggestedRemedy
 insert "the"

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Change "@@Clause 76@@ PCS" to "Clause 76 PCS". Make the link to Clause 76 live!

Cl 75 **SC 75.3.1.5** **P 56** **L 46** # 2010
 Frazier, Howard Broadcom

Comment Type **E** **Comment Status** **D**
 I think that the word "see" should be inserted right before the cross-reference at the end of this note.

SuggestedRemedy
 as per comment.

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 75 **SC 75.3.5.2** **P 59** **L 21** # 2362
 Law, David 3Com

Comment Type **E** **Comment Status** **D**
 Change the text '.. Clause 75 type PMDs.' to read '.. 10GBASE-PR and 10/1GBASE-PRX type PMDs.'.

SuggestedRemedy
 See comment.

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Change text "(.)Clause 75 type PMDs." to read "(.)PMDs defined in Clause 75.".

Cl 75 **SC 75.3.5.3** **P 59** **L 25** # 1652
 Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks

Comment Type **ER** **Comment Status** **D**
 Heading is "10GBASE-PR and 1000BASE-PX Signal detect functions". This subclause does not describe 1000BASE-PX

SuggestedRemedy
 Change heading to "10GBASE-PR and 10/1GBASE-PRX Signal detect functions"

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 75 **SC 75.4.1** **P 61** **L 30** # 1591
 Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks

Comment Type **E** **Comment Status** **D** *Figure 75-5, Figure 75-6 title*
 The title of Figure 75-5 is "Relaxed PR-D type PMD specifications" this is inappropriate

SuggestedRemedy
 change title to "Graphical representation of region of PR-D type transmitter compliance"

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 See also comment #1594

Cl 75 **SC 75.4.1** **P 61** **L 5** # 1715
 Lin, Rujian Shanghai Luster Terab

Comment Type **E** **Comment Status** **D**
 Shaded area indicates compliant part.

SuggestedRemedy
 Correction: Shaded area indicates the compliant part.

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Change to "Shaded area indicates the compliant part".

Cl 75 **SC 75.4.2** **P 61** **L 40** # 1592
 Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks

Comment Type **E** **Comment Status** **D**
 The text states "Either the damage threshold included in Table 75-6 and Table 75-7 shall be met,..." but only one of the damage thresholds needs to be met for a particular receiver.

SuggestedRemedy
 Change to "Either the damage threshold included in Table 75-6 or Table 75-7 shall be met,..."

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 75 **SC 75.4.2** **P 61** **L 43** # 2011
 Frazier, Howard Broadcom

Comment Type **E** **Comment Status** **D**
 Need a couple more definite articles in this paragraph. Insert the word "The" before "Damage threshold" in two places.

SuggestedRemedy
 as per comment.

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 75 **SC 75.5** **P 64** **L 7** # 1767
 KIMURA, Mitsunobu Hitachi Communicatio

Comment Type **E** **Comment Status** **D** *PMD type lists*
 "PR10, PR20, PR30" should be "PR10, PR20, and PR30". Also, in L8, "PRX10, PRX20, PRX30" has the same issue.

SuggestedRemedy
 L7: "PR10, PR20, and PR30"
 L8: "PRX10, PRX20, and PRX30"

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 [Subclause number was fixed]
 See comment #2289

Cl 75 **SC 75.5** **P 68** **L 18** # 1768
 KIMURA, Mitsunobu Hitachi Communicatio

Comment Type **E** **Comment Status** **D**
 Comment "c" doesn't have a period (".").

SuggestedRemedy
 A period is needed.

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 [Subclause number was fixed]

Cl 75 SC 75.5.1 P 65 L 33 # 1596
 Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks

Comment Type E Comment Status D

Table 75-9 Note c uses the abbreviation "DFB". This is not in the list of abbreviations.

SuggestedRemedy

Add "DFB" to the list of abbreviations

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Add a new abbreviation in C01/1.5 to read as follows "DFB Distributed Feedback Laser".
 Format as appropriate.

Cl 75 SC 75.5.1 P 65 L 33 # 1595
 Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks

Comment Type E Comment Status D

Table 75-9 Note c states "In case FP-LD is used, RMS spectral width shall comply with Table 75-10. In case DFB laser is used, transmitter's side mode suppression ratio (min) shall be 30 dB." This is poor english.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to "If the transmitter employs a Fabry-Perot laser, the RMS spectral width shall comply with Table 75-10. If the transmitter employs a DFB laser, the side mode suppression ratio (min) shall be 30 dB."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Make sure it gets implemented together with comment #1596.

Cl 75 SC 75.5.1 P 65 L 5 # 1716
 Lin, Rujian Shanghai Luster Terab

Comment Type E Comment Status D

Shaded area indicates compliant part.

SuggestedRemedy

Correction: Shaded area indicates the compliant part.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Shaded area indicates the compliant part.
 See comment #1715

Cl 75 SC 75.5.1 P 66 L 14 # 181526
 Hamano, Hiroshi Fujitsu Labs.

Comment Type E Comment Status D

In Figure 75-6, relaxed power level indication suffix seems incorrect in "Apostrophe" placement.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "AVP 'min" to "AVP' min".

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

== Resolution from Denver 0806 Meeting ==
 REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter. To be resubmitted by TF Chair against next draft.

Cl 75 SC 75.5.1 P 66 L 9 # 1800
 Hamano, Hiroshi Fujitsu Labs.

Comment Type E Comment Status D

In Figure 75-6, 'ER = 9 dB' dashed line is partially hidden behind the hatching pattern. It looks strange, if there is no specific meaning to do so.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the placement order to show the dashed line in front.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 75 SC 75.5.2 P 66 L 24 # 1594
 Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks

Comment Type E Comment Status D Figure 75-5, Figure 75-6 title

The title of Figure 75-6 is "Relaxed PR-U type PMD specifications" this is inappropriate

SuggestedRemedy

change title to "Graphical representation of region of PR-U type transmitter compliance"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 See also comment #1591.

<i>Cl</i> 75	<i>SC</i> 75.6	<i>P</i> 69	<i>L</i> 10	# 2176
Woodward, Ted		Telcordia Technologie		
<i>Comment Type</i> T		<i>Comment Status</i> D		
Table 75-12 and Table 75-13 do not provide a source reference to fiber Types B1.1, B1.3.				
<i>Suggested Remedy</i>				
include reference to Table 75-20, or to appropriate ITU documents				
<i>Proposed Response</i>		<i>Response Status</i> W		
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. [changed from "E" to "T"] [Page number was added] See comment #1805				

<i>Cl</i> 75	<i>SC</i> 75.6	<i>P</i> 69	<i>L</i> 27	# 1769
KIMURA, Mitsunobu		Hitachi Communicatio		
<i>Comment Type</i> E		<i>Comment Status</i> D		
Comment "a" doesn't have a period (".").				
<i>Suggested Remedy</i>				
A period is needed.				
<i>Proposed Response</i>		<i>Response Status</i> W		
PROPOSED ACCEPT. [Subclause number was fixed]				

<i>Cl</i> 75	<i>SC</i> 75.6	<i>P</i> 69	<i>L</i> 29	# 2166
Bennett, Michael		LBNL		
<i>Comment Type</i> E		<i>Comment Status</i> D		
In footnote d: Nominal distance refers to the expected maximum distance a PMD will be capable of achieving in a typical ODN, numerous ODN implementation practices may result ** is ** longer or shorter distances being actually achievable in ** users** network.				
"is" should be "in" and users' should be user's				
<i>Suggested Remedy</i>				
replace "is" with "in" and "users'" should be a user's				
<i>Proposed Response</i>		<i>Response Status</i> W		
PROPOSED ACCEPT. [Subclause number was fixed]				

<i>Cl</i> 75	<i>SC</i> 75.6	<i>P</i> 69	<i>L</i> 30	# 1717
Lin, Rujian		Shanghai Luster Terab		
<i>Comment Type</i> E		<i>Comment Status</i> D		
...in a typical ODN, numerous ODN implementation practices may result is				
<i>Suggested Remedy</i>				
Correction:...in a typical ODN. Numerous ODN implementation practices may result in				
<i>Proposed Response</i>		<i>Response Status</i> W		
PROPOSED ACCEPT.				

<i>Cl</i> 75	<i>SC</i> 75.6	<i>P</i> 69	<i>L</i> 32	# 1597
Anslow, Peter		Nortel Networks		
<i>Comment Type</i> E		<i>Comment Status</i> D		<i>BER limit description</i>
Table 75-12 Note e is "The available power budget assumes input BER from the PMD service interface of 10-3. The required BER of 10-12 at the PCS service interface is achieved by the FEC function of the PCS." This is written from the point of view of the FEC function in the PCS, but the clause is about the PMD not the PCS. Should be re-worded.				
<i>Suggested Remedy</i>				
Change Note e to "The available power budget assumes a BER at the PMD service interface of 10-3. The required BER of 10-12 at the PCS service interface is achieved by the FEC function of the PCS." Also, use a non-breaking - (Ctrl-q Shift-p) so that the 12 does not appear on a different line from 10-				
<i>Proposed Response</i>		<i>Response Status</i> W		
PROPOSED ACCEPT. Combine with comment #1598.				

<i>Cl</i> 75	<i>SC</i> 75.6	<i>P</i> 70	<i>L</i> 15	# 1799
Hamano, Hiroshi		Fujitsu Labs.		
<i>Comment Type</i> E		<i>Comment Status</i> D		
In Table 75-13, 'Channel insertion loss (min)' line alone is messy, compared to 'Channel insertion loss (max)', and not consistent with Table 75-12.				
<i>Suggested Remedy</i>				
Combine US and DS columns into one for each power budget class.				
<i>Proposed Response</i>		<i>Response Status</i> W		
PROPOSED ACCEPT.				

Cl 75 **SC 75.6** **P70** **L 20** # 1770
 KIMURA, Mitsunobu Hitachi Communicatio

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**
 Comment "a" doesn't have a period (".").

SuggestedRemedy
 A period is needed.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 [Subclause number was fixed]

Cl 75 **SC 75.6** **P70** **L 23** # 2167
 Bennett, Michael LBNL

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**
 Footnote d "is" should be "in" and "users" should be "user's"

SuggestedRemedy
 replace "is" with "in" and "users" with "user's"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 [Subclause number was fixed]
 See also comment #2166

Cl 75 **SC 75.6** **P70** **L 23** # 1718
 Lin, Rujian Shanghai Luster Terab

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**
 ...in a typical ODN, numerous ODN implementation practices may result is

SuggestedRemedy
 Correction:...in a typical ODN. Numerous ODN implementation practices may result in

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 See comment #1717

Cl 75 **SC 75.6** **P70** **L 25** # 1598
 Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D** *BER limit description*
 Table 75-13 Note e is "The available power budget assumes input BER from the PMD service interface of 10-3. The required BER of 10-12 at the PCS service interface is achieved by the FEC function of the PCS." This is written from the point of view of the FEC function in the PCS, but the clause is about the PMD not the PCS. Should be re-worded.

SuggestedRemedy
 Change Note e to "The available power budget assumes a BER at the PMD service interface of 10-3. The required BER of 10-12 at the PCS service interface is achieved by the FEC function of the PCS."
 Also, use a non-breaking - (Ctrl-q Shift-p) so that the 12 does not appear on a different line from 10-

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 See comment #1597
 Combine with comment #1597.

Cl 75 **SC 75.6.1** **P70** **L 40** # 2291
 Hajduczenia, Marek Nokia Siemens Networ

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **D** *Figure 75-7 links*
 Incorrect reference to Figure 75-5. Figure 75-8 should be linked in this place. The same is true for reference in line 46.

SuggestedRemedy
 Change reference to Figure 75-7 to Figure 75-8 (the one on page 71). Make sure that both changes (in line 40 and 41) are live.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 See comment #181525

CI 75 SC 75.6.1 P70 L 40 # 181525
 Hamano, Hiroshi Fujitsu Labs.

Comment Type E Comment Status D Figure 75-7 links

Figure number reference is incorrect.
 That in Line 47 is also the same.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "Figure 75-7" to "Figure 75-8".

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 [Page numbers were updated to D2.0]

== Resolution from Denver 0806 Meeting ==
 REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter. To be resubmitted by TF Chair
 against next draft.

=====

CI 75 SC 75.6.1.1 P70 L 44 # 1653
 Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks

Comment Type ER Comment Status D Figure 75-7 links

The first paragraph of 75.6.1.1. refers to Figure 75-7. This should be Figure 75-8

SuggestedRemedy

Change reference to Figure 75-8

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 See comment #181525

CI 75 SC 75.6.1.1 P70 L 47 # 2388
 Law, David 3Com

Comment Type T Comment Status D Figure 75-7 links

Cross-reference error.

Figure 75-5 is '10/1GBASE-PRX-U3 transmitter spectral limits' whereas Figure 75-8 is the
 'Wavelength allocation plan for (a) EPON and (b) 10G-EPON.' that seems to be referenced.

SuggestedRemedy

Change '..in Figure 75-7.' to read '.. in Figure 75-8.'

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 See comment #181525

CI 75 SC 75.6.1.1 P70 L 49 # 2168
 Bennett, Michael LBNL

Comment Type E Comment Status D

sub-sets should not be hyphenated

SuggestedRemedy

replace sub-sets with subsets

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 [Subclause number was fixed]
 [Page number was added]

CI 75 SC 75.6.1.2 P71 L 34 # 2292
 Hajduczenia, Marek Nokia Siemens Networ

Comment Type T Comment Status D - Clause 76 missed reference

Incorrect reference to Clause 76. In text "specified in @@Clause 76@@", reference to
 clause 75 should be used. Clause 76 does not specify PMD parameters.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "specified in @@Clause 76@@" to "specified in @@Clause 75@@"
 Make sure that the link is live.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Change "specified in @@Clause 76@@" to "specified in Clause 75."
 Make sure that the link is live.

CI 75 SC 75.6.1.2 P71 L 34 # 1654
 Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks

Comment Type ER Comment Status D - Clause 76 missed reference

This states that "The 10 Gb/s upstream transmission uses the 1260 - 1280 nm wavelength
 band, as specified in @@Clause 76@@" but the wavelengths are specified in clause 75

SuggestedRemedy

change to "The 10 Gb/s upstream transmission uses the 1260 - 1280 nm wavelength band,
 as specified in Clause 75"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 See comment #2292

Cl 75 SC 75.7 P71 L 50 # 2348
 Law, David 3Com
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Informative Annexes
 The term 'stack' isn't defined in IEEE 802.3 or used anywhere else, I assume this is a reference to the 7 layer model, besides this text is a discussion of implementation options rather than the architectural model.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change the text '.. point in the stack it is ..' to read '.. point in the implementation it is ..'
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 Implement together with comment #2373

Cl 75 SC 75.7 P72 L 45 # 2177
 Woodward, Ted Telcordia Technologie
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Informative Annexes, Implementation choices
 This section has a lot of good implementation detail. This is informative, but may be too emphatic in stipulating solutions. For example, "There are three implementation choices in this regard..." should be changed to suggest that there are 'at least three', and not to imply that these are the only solutions.
 SuggestedRemedy
 change ' There are three implementation choices .. ' to ' Three exemplary implementation choices ... are:'
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 [Page number was added]
 [Subclause number was fixed]
 See comment #2367
 Implement together with comment #2373

Cl 75 SC 75.7 P72 L 46 # 2349
 Law, David 3Com
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Informative Annexes
 We use the term 'implementation' rather than 'design'.
 SuggestedRemedy
 On page 72, lines 46 and 50, and on page 73 lines 2 and 4 change the text 'This design ..' to read 'This implementation ..'.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 Implement together with comment #2373

Cl 75 SC 75.7 P73 L 3 # 2350
 Law, David 3Com
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Informative Annexes
 The text has already stated that this is the most complex, it is up to the implementer to judge what the cost benefit is for them.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Delete the text 'and it is unclear if the benefits outweigh the costs.'
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 Implement together with comment #2373

Cl 75 SC 75.7 P73 L 46 # 2351
 Law, David 3Com
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Informative Annexes
 The text at the start of this paragraph states that it describes 'One of the simplest methods ..' and this last sentence could be added to every paragraph in this informative information, other implementations can be used. This sentence is therefore not required.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Delete the text 'Other implementation specific methods to control the APD-TIA speed are also possible, though are not discussed in this document.'
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 Implement together with comment #2373

Cl 75 SC 75.8 P74 L 1 # 2293
 Hajduczenia, Marek Nokia Siemens Network
 Comment Type E Comment Status D Informative Annexes, Labels in 75-11 and 75-12
 Figures 75-11 and 75-12 are affected.
 There are strange character in place of "-" sign in the slope description.
 Replace "Slope = 'Äi20 dB/d" with "Slope = -20 dB/d"
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace "Slope = 'Äi20 dB/d" with "Slope = -20 dB/d" in Figures 75-11 and 75-12.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 75 **SC 75.8** **P74** **L 12** # |2076|
 Kramer, Glen Teknovus, Inc.

Comment Type **E** **Comment Status** **D** *as, Labels in 75-11 and 75-12*
 Corrupted labels in Figures 75-11 and 75-12

SuggestedRemedy
 Correct font

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 See comment #2293

Cl 75 **SC 75.8** **P74** **L 13** # |2002|
 Brown, Alan Wave7 Optics, Inc.

Comment Type **ER** **Comment Status** **D** *as, Labels in 75-11 and 75-12*
 Garbage characters describe slope in Figure 75-11.

SuggestedRemedy
 Correct the figure.

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 See comment #2293

Cl 75 **SC 75.8** **P74** **L 12** # |1600|
 Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks

Comment Type **E** **Comment Status** **D** *as, Labels in 75-11 and 75-12*
 In Figures 75-11 and 75-12 the "Slope = " label is corrupted

SuggestedRemedy
 Change to "Slope = -20 dB/dec"

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 See comment #2293

Cl 75 **SC 75.8** **P74** **L 25** # |2003|
 Brown, Alan Wave7 Optics, Inc.

Comment Type **ER** **Comment Status** **D** *as, Labels in 75-11 and 75-12*
 Garbage characters describe slope in Figure 75-12.

SuggestedRemedy
 Correct the figure.

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 See comment #2293

Cl 75 **SC 75.8** **P74** **L 12** # |2353|
 Law, David 3Com

Comment Type **E** **Comment Status** **D** *as, Labels in 75-11 and 75-12*
 Typo.

SuggestedRemedy
 Both Figure 75-11 and 75-12 have a font issue with the text related to the slope value.

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 See comment #2293

Cl 75 **SC 75.8** **P74** **L 48** # |2371|
 Law, David 3Com

Comment Type **ER** **Comment Status** **D** *ixes, Clause 75.8 jitter issues*
 The first sentence of the notes to Table 75-14 belongs in an editions note and not in a note to the table.

SuggestedRemedy
 Move the text 'These are preliminary jitter values based on simulations @BER = 10-12 and need to be finalized.' to an editors note.

Make the same change for Table 75-15, Page 75, line 15 and Table 75-16, Page 75, line 36.

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 See comment #2077 for Table 75-15 and Table 75-14. See comment #2078 for Table 75-16.

Cl 75 **SC 75.8** **P74** **L 12** # |1798|
 Hamano, Hiroshi Fujitsu Labs.

Comment Type **E** **Comment Status** **D** *as, Labels in 75-11 and 75-12*
 In Figure 75-11 and Figure 75-12, illegal characters are used.

SuggestedRemedy
 They should be 'Slope = -20 dB/dec'.

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 See comment #2293

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 See comment #2077 for Table 75-15 and Table 75-14. See comment #2078 for Table 75-16.

CI 75 SC 75.8 P74 L 48 # 1601
 Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks

Comment Type T Comment Status D Issues, Clause 75.8 jitter issues
 Tables 75-14 and 75-15 have a Note "These are preliminary jitter values based on simulations @BER = 10-12 and need to be finalized." This information should be shown in an Editor's note stating "to be removed prior to release"

SuggestedRemedy
 Move these notes in to an "Editor's note"

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 [Changed from "E" to "T"]
 See comment #2077

CI 75 SC 75.8 P74 L 9 # 2178
 Woodward, Ted Telcordia Technologie

Comment Type E Comment Status D Issues, Labels in 75-11 and 75-12
 Figures 75-11 and 75-12 appear to have formatting errors in slope indications.

SuggestedRemedy
 correct formatting bug

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 [Subclause number was fixed]
 [Page number was fixed]

CI 75 SC 75.8 P75 L 35 # 2078
 Kramer, Glen Teknovus, Inc.

Comment Type T Comment Status D Issues, Clause 75.8 jitter issues
 Either add new values based on a new data or keep existing values, if there is no new data. In either case, the statement "These numbers are reproduced from IEEE 802.3ah specifications @@Table 60-11@@ and may be revised if supported by new data" should not be part of the standard.

SuggestedRemedy
 Remove the sentence

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 Implement into comment #1719

CI 75 SC 75.8 P75 L 36 # 1602
 Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks

Comment Type E Comment Status D Issues, Clause 75.8 jitter issues
 The Note to Table 75-16 refers to "802.3ah" which will have been replaced by a revision of 802.3

SuggestedRemedy
 change the note to: "These values are reproduced from Table 60-11 and may be revised if supported by new data." or better yet, delete it altogether.

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 See comment #2078

CI 75 SC 75.9 P76 L 10 # 2378
 Law, David 3Com

Comment Type T Comment Status D
 The text reads 'In measuring TP1 and TP5 it is ..', in measuring what, I assume Jitter.

SuggestedRemedy
 Change to read 'When measuring Jitter at TP1 and TP5 it is ..'.

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Change the offending text to read "When measuring jitter at TP1 and TP5, it is (.)"

CI 75 SC 75.9 P76 L 11 # 2354
 Law, David 3Com

Comment Type E Comment Status D
 Make the frequency specifications parenthetical;, and use i.e. rather than viz.

SuggestedRemedy
 Change the text '.. frequencies viz. 4 MHz for 10.3125 GBd receiver and 637 kHz for 1.25 GBd receiver are ..' to read '.. frequencies (i.e., 4 MHz for 10.3125 GBd receiver and 637 kHz for 1.25 GBd receiver) are ..'.

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 75 **SC 75.9** **P76** **L 12** # 2355
Law, David 3Com

Comment Type **E** **Comment Status** **D**

Typo, section should be subclause, and definitive is redundant, shall's define what is authoritative or not.

SuggestedRemedy

Change '.. The following sections describe definitive patterns and test procedures..' to read '.. The following subclauses describe patterns and test procedures ..'.

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 75 **SC 75.9.1** **P76** **L 21** # 1656
Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks

Comment Type **ER** **Comment Status** **D**

Reference is made to G.650.1 which is not in the references section

SuggestedRemedy

Add a reference to G.650.1

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Add a reference to C01/1.3 with the following contents "ITU-T Recommendation G.650.1, 2004-Transmission media characteristics - Optical fibre cables". Sort remaining entries as appropriate.

Cl 75 **SC 75.9.11** **P79** **L 36** # 1720
Lin, Rujian Shanghai Luster Terab

Comment Type **E** **Comment Status** **D**

Receiver sensitivity is defined for the random pattern test frame, or.....

SuggestedRemedy

Correction: Receiver sensitivity is defined using the random pattern test frame, or.....

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.

Original sentence reads well.

Cl 75 **SC 75.9.11** **P79** **L 39** # 1608
Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks

Comment Type **E** **Comment Status** **D**

This says "The sensitivity shall be met for the bit error ratio defined in Table 75-6, Table 75-7, and Table 75-11 as appropriate." but only one table applies to a particular PMD

SuggestedRemedy

Change "and" to "or" to give "The sensitivity shall be met for the bit error ratio defined in Table 75-6, Table 75-7, or Table 75-11 as appropriate."

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 75 **SC 75.9.12** **P79** **L 45** # 1609
Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks

Comment Type **E** **Comment Status** **D** Page 79, line 44-45

This says "the receiver shall meet the specified bit error ratio at the power level and signal quality defined in Table 75-6, Table 75-7, and Table 75-11 as appropriate," but only one table applies to a particular PMD

SuggestedRemedy

Change "and" to "or" to give "the receiver shall meet the specified bit error ratio at the power level and signal quality defined in Table 75-6, Table 75-7, or Table 75-11 as appropriate,"

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

See also comment #2191

Cl 75 **SC 75.9.15** **P80** **L 15** # 1722
Lin, Rujian Shanghai Luster Terab

Comment Type **E** **Comment Status** **D**

value

SuggestedRemedy

Correction: its value is

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

See comment #1721

Cl 75 **SC 75.9.15** **P 80** **L 16** # |1723

Lin, Rujian Shanghai Luster Terab

Comment Type **E** **Comment Status** **D**

value is less than...

SuggestedRemedy

Correction: with a value less than...

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.
See comment #1721

Cl 75 **SC 75.9.2** **P 76** **L 23** # |1771

KIMURA, Mitsunobu Hitachi Communicatio

Comment Type **E** **Comment Status** **D**

In the title of 75.9.2, "10G EPON PMDs" should be "10G-EPON PMDs".

SuggestedRemedy

"10G-EPON PMDs"

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.
[Subclause number was fixed]

Cl 75 **SC 75.9.2** **P 76** **L 25** # |2356

Law, David 3Com

Comment Type **E** **Comment Status** **D**

Not sure what a 'Clause 75 receiver' is. Mirror text used on line 27 for transmitters.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the text 'The Clause 75 receivers are required ..' to read 'All the receiver types specified in Clause 75 are required ..'.

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 75 **SC 75.9.2** **P 76** **L 27** # |2379

Law, David 3Com

Comment Type **T** **Comment Status** **D**

This is the only use of the term 'PON Plant' - the term used elsewhere in the draft is the channel.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the text '.. the PON plant ..' to read '.. the channel ..'.

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.
- not really sure how it impacts draft technically

Cl 75 **SC 75.9.2** **P 76** **L 31** # |1772

KIMURA, Mitsunobu Hitachi Communicatio

Comment Type **E** **Comment Status** **D**

"Table 75-5, Table75-8, Table75-9" needs "and".

SuggestedRemedy

"Table 75-5, Table75-8, and Table75-9"

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
[Subclause number was fixed]
"Table 75-5, Table 75-8, and Table 75-9"

Cl 75 **SC 75.9.3** **P 76** **L 35** # |2372

Law, David 3Com

Comment Type **ER** **Comment Status** **D**

Compliance is to be achieved by meeting the normative requirements of the standard as described by the shall statements.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete the text 'Compliance is to be achieved in normal operation.'.

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 75 SC 75.9.3 P76 L 35 # 2380
Law, David 3Com

Comment Type T Comment Status D

This subclause states 'Two types of test patterns are used, square wave (52.9.1.2) and other (52.9.1.1) for testing ...'. I however don't see any test pattern called 'other' defined in 52.9.1.1, as stated at the start of that subclause 'Patterns 1, 2, and 3 are defined in Table 52-21. Pattern 3 is optional.'

SuggestedRemedy

Please match this reference to the patterns defined in 52.9.1.1.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Change:

'Two types of test patterns are used, square wave (@@Subclause 52.9.1.2@@) and other (@@Subclause 52.9.1.1@@) for testing of 10 Gb/s optical PMDs.'

to

'Two types of test patterns are used for testing of 10 Gb/s optical PMDs: square wave (52.9.1.2) and patterns 1, 2 or 3 (52.9.1.1).'

CI 75 SC 75.9.4 P76 L 43 # 1603
Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks

Comment Type E Comment Status D ANSI/TIA/EIA-455-127

This says "The center wavelength and spectral width (RMS) shall meet specifications according to ANSI/TIA/EIA-455-127 under modulated conditions ..." which reads as if the specifications are from ANSI/TIA/EIA-455-127 rather than the measurement methods.

SuggestedRemedy

change to "The center wavelength and spectral width (RMS) shall meet the specifications when measured according to ANSI/TIA/EIA-455-127 under modulated conditions ..."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

See comment #1933

CI 75 SC 75.9.4 P76 L 49 # 1604
Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Note 2 is "The 20 dB width for SLM lasers is taken as 6.07 times the RMS width." but the 20 dB width is not used

SuggestedRemedy

Delete Note 2

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

[Changed from "E" to "T"]

CI 75 SC 75.9.6 P77 L 35 # 1605
Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks

Comment Type E Comment Status D

The text says "Extinction ratio shall meet specifications according to IEC 61820-2-2 with the port transmitting ..." which reads as if the specifications are from IEC 61820-2-2 rather than the measurement methods.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to "The extinction ratio shall meet the specifications when measured according to IEC 61820-2-2 with the port transmitting ..."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 75 SC 75.9.7 P77 L 43 # 1606
Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks

Comment Type E Comment Status D

The second sentence is "A description of OMA measurements for 10 Gb/s PHYs shall be compliant with the description found in @@Subclause 52.9.5@@.". This seems to be placing a requirement on a description rather than a measurement.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to "The OMA measurements for 10 Gb/s PHYs shall be compliant with the description found in Subclause 52.9.5."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change the offending text to read: "The OMA measurements for 10 Gb/s PHYs shall be compliant with the description found in 52.9.5."

CI 75 SC 75.9.9 P78 L 24 # 2079
Kramer, Glen Teknovus, Inc.

Comment Type T Comment Status D and Figure 75-14 references

Figures 75-13 and 75-14 are different, but have the same titles and no further explanation in text.

SuggestedRemedy

Add text to the titles to explain that the figures represent different line rates.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #1607 for changes in the accompanying text.

Change title for Figure 75-13 to read "Transmitter eye mask definition for 1 Gb/s PMDs"

Change title for Figure 75-14 to read "Transmitter eye mask definition for 10 Gb/s PMDs"

Cl 75 SC 75.9.9 P78 L3 # 1607
 Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks

Comment Type E Comment Status D and Figure 75-14 references

The first sentence is: "The required transmitter pulse shape characteristics are specified in the form of a mask of the transmitter eye diagram as shown in Figure 75-13 and Figure 75-14."

However it is unclear which diagram relates to which transmitter types.

SuggestedRemedy

"The required transmitter pulse shape characteristics are specified in the form of a mask of the transmitter eye diagram as shown in Figure 75-13 for 1 Gb/s PHYs and Figure 75-14 for 10 Gb/s PHYs."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change the indicated text to read: "The required transmitter pulse shape characteristics are specified in the form of a mask of the transmitter eye diagram as shown in Figure 75-13 for 1 Gb/s PMDs and Figure 75-14 for 10 Gb/s PMDs."

Cl 76 SC P99 L27 # 1774
 KIMURA, Mitsunobu Hitachi Communicatio

Comment Type E Comment Status D typo

Titles of Figure 76-3 and 76-4 have periods (".").

SuggestedRemedy

The periods should be removed.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See resolution to comment 1773

Cl 76 SC 1.6.1.5 P102 L39 # 1776
 KIMURA, Mitsunobu Hitachi Communicatio

Comment Type E Comment Status D typo

A period is missed.

SuggestedRemedy

A period should be placed.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 76 SC 2.2.1.5 P110 L39 # 1777
 KIMURA, Mitsunobu Hitachi Communicatio

Comment Type E Comment Status D reword

"a state machines" and "the state machines" should be replaced as "a state diagram" and "the state diagram".

SuggestedRemedy

"a state diagram"; "the state diagram".

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 76 SC 2.2.4.1 P113 L29 # 1778
 KIMURA, Mitsunobu Hitachi Communicatio

Comment Type E Comment Status D typo

Font of "P(x)" is not proper.

SuggestedRemedy

Font of "P(x)" should be the same one as of the equation after "vector".

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 76 SC 2.2.5 P116 L19 # 1779
 KIMURA, Mitsunobu Hitachi Communicatio

Comment Type E Comment Status D typo

Two periods are shown.

SuggestedRemedy

A period should be removed.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 76 SC 2.2.5 P117 L46 # 1780
 KIMURA, Mitsunobu Hitachi Communicatio

Comment Type E Comment Status D typo

Two spaces are shown between "by two".

SuggestedRemedy

A space should be removed.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 76 SC 2.2.5.1 P118 L41 # 1781
 KIMURA, Mitsunobu Hitachi Communicatio

Comment Type E Comment Status D typo

The last word of the sentence "A 66-bit ..." is "transmissino" and has no period.

SuggestedRemedy
 Should be "transmission."

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 76 SC 2.3.4.4 P134 L51 # 1782
 KIMURA, Mitsunobu Hitachi Communicatio

Comment Type E Comment Status D typo

The first word of the sentence is "TThe".

SuggestedRemedy
 Should be "The".

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 76 SC 2.3.7.1 P136 L24 # 1783
 KIMURA, Mitsunobu Hitachi Communicatio

Comment Type E Comment Status D typo

Between the words "Subclause" and "76.2.2.1.1", there is no space.

SuggestedRemedy
 Should be "Subclause 76.2.2.1.1."

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 76 SC 3 P137 L29 # 1784
 KIMURA, Mitsunobu Hitachi Communicatio

Comment Type E Comment Status D typo

"100BASEPX" is shown. A hyphen should be placed between BASE and PX.

SuggestedRemedy
 Should be "1000BASE-PX".

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 76 SC 4.3 P141 L27 # 1785
 KIMURA, Mitsunobu Hitachi Communicatio

Comment Type E Comment Status D typo

In the "Item" cell, "FECEncoder" is shown. A hyphen should be placed between FEC and Encoder.

SuggestedRemedy
 Should be "FEC-Encoder".

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 76 SC 4.4.7 P144 L1 # 1786
 KIMURA, Mitsunobu Hitachi Communicatio

Comment Type E Comment Status D typo

In the title of 76.4.4.7, "state machines" is shown.

SuggestedRemedy
 Should be "state diagrams".

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 76 SC 76 P95 L1 # 2308
 Hajduczenia, Marek Nokia Siemens Networ

Comment Type E Comment Status D joint

In Clause 76, term "Reconciliation sublayer" is used interchangeably with "Reconciliation Sublayer". Align the capitalization for all terms and then align them through the whole draft.

SuggestedRemedy
 In Clause 76, term "Reconciliation sublayer" is used interchangeably with "Reconciliation Sublayer". Align the capitalization for all terms and then align them through the whole draft.

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Use "Reconciliation Sublayer"

CI 76 SC 76 P95 L 30 # 1937
Dawe, Piers Avago

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Need to mention FEC in the introduction to this clause. PMA = Physical Medium Attachment not Physical Media Attachment

SuggestedRemedy

This Clause describes the Reconciliation Sublayer (RS), Physical Coding Sublayer (PCS) with mandatory RS(255, 223) FEC), and Physical Medium Attachment (PMA) sublayer used with 10GBASE-PR and 10/1GBASE-PRX point-to-multipoint (P2MP) networks.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

This Clause describes the Reconciliation Sublayer (RS), Physical Coding Sublayer (PCS) with FEC, and Physical Medium Attachment (PMA) sublayer used with 10GBASE-PR and 10/1GBASE-PRX point-to-multipoint (P2MP) networks.

CI 76 SC 76.1 P95 L 37 # 1938
Dawe, Piers Avago

Comment Type T Comment Status D

"76.1 Reconciliation Sublayer (RS)": need a more specific title, as there are many RSs

SuggestedRemedy

76.1 Reconciliation Sublayer (RS) for 10G-EPON

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 76 SC 76.1.1 P95 L 40 # 2012
Frazier, Howard Broadcom

Comment Type E Comment Status D

Decapitalize "Subclause".

SuggestedRemedy

per comment.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 76 SC 76.1.1 P95 L 41 # 2081
Kramer, Glen Teknovus, Inc.

Comment Type E Comment Status D

grammar

Sentence uses "at one data rate" and "in another data rate"

SuggestedRemedy

Replace "in" with "at"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 76 SC 76.1.1 P95 L 42 # 1724
Lin, Rujian Shanghai Luster Terab

Comment Type E Comment Status D

receive in...

SuggestedRemedy

Correction: receiving at

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 76 SC 76.1.1 P96 L 45 # 2180
Woodward, Ted Telcordia Technologie

Comment Type E Comment Status D *typo*

Figure 76-1 has a typographical error in the legend indicating that hatched region is "described in Clause 76Clause 75"

SuggestedRemedy

remove extraneous Clause 75 reference

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 76 SC 76.1.1 P96 L 45 # 2019
Frazier, Howard Broadcom

Comment Type ER Comment Status D *DupTxdp96*

in Figure 76-1, "Clause 76Clause75" should be "Clause 76".

SuggestedRemedy

Delete extraneous "Clause 75".

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 76 **SC 76.1.1** **P96** **L 45** # 2149
 Lynskey, Eric Teknovus

Comment Type **E** **Comment Status** **D**

In Figure 76-1, the label incorrectly includes Clause 75. The PMD is not highlighted in the figure.

SuggestedRemedy
 Remove "Clause 75".

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 76 **SC 76.1.2** **P98** **L 3** # 2020
 Frazier, Howard Broadcom

Comment Type **ER** **Comment Status** **D**

Please don't use the word "bridge" to describe the interface between the MAC and the PHY. "Bridge" has a specific meaning in IEEE 802 standards.

SuggestedRemedy
 delete the words "used to bridge" in two places in this paragraph.

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Replace "interface used to bridge between"
 with "interface used to transfer data between"

Cl 76 **SC 76.1.2.3** **P98** **L 37** # 2304
 Hajduczenia, Marek Nokia Siemens Networ

Comment Type **E** **Comment Status** **D**

Style of this paragraph is significantly different than the style of other paragraphs in the draft. Apply the same style as in paragraph 76.1.2.1 for example.

SuggestedRemedy
 Apply the same style to paragraph 76.1.2.3 as in paragraph 76.1.2.1 for example.

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 76 **SC 76.1.2.3** **P99** **L 31** # 2305
 Hajduczenia, Marek Nokia Siemens Networ

Comment Type **ER** **Comment Status** **D** *StrayChar*

There are funny characters in Figure 76-4 in MAC name. It says currently "1G'ÄiMAC" or "10G'ÄiMAC" whereas it should say "1G-MAC" or "10G-MAC", respectively.

SuggestedRemedy
 Change "1G'ÄiMAC" and "10G'ÄiMAC" to "1G-MAC" and "10G-MAC", respectively, in Figure 76-4.

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 76 **SC 76.1.2.3** **P99** **L 31** # 2013
 Frazier, Howard Broadcom

Comment Type **E** **Comment Status** **D** *StrayChar*

If Figure 76-4, there are some strange characters in the rectangles across the top of the figure. I can't tell what they should be.

SuggestedRemedy
 replace with correct characters.

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 76 SC 76.1.2.3 P99 L 32 # 181546
 Lynskey, Eric Teknovus
Comment Type E Comment Status D resubmit
 Figure 76-4 has corrupted speed labels for MACs.
SuggestedRemedy
 Replace speeds with the following (left to right):
 1G-1G, 1G-1G, 10G-1G, 10G-1G, 10G-10G, 10G-10G
 OR
 1 Gb/s, 1 Gb/s, 10/1 Gb/s, 10/1 Gb/s, 10 Gb/s, 10 Gb/s
Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 The figure appears to be correct now.
 == Resolution from Denver 0806 Meeting ==
 REJECT.
 This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter. To be resubmitted by TF Chair
 against next draft.
 (was against c76)
 =====

Cl 76 SC 76.1.2.3 P99 L 52 # 2083
 Kramer, Glen Teknovus, Inc.
Comment Type T Comment Status D
 Primitive name is not correct
SuggestedRemedy
 PLS.DATA should be PLS_DATA
Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 76 SC 76.1.3 P100 L 10 # 2084
 Kramer, Glen Teknovus, Inc.
Comment Type ER Comment Status D dupTctp100
 These two paragraphs repeat the same thing. Change the text as shown in the remedy.
 The statement about single PLS_DATA.request primitive being active at any time is only
 important for the OLT, since this is where the multiple MAC connect to single (X)GMII.
 Move this statement after the OLT sentence.
SuggestedRemedy
 Perlace 2nd and 3rd paragraphs with the following text:
 "As described in Subclause @@77.1.2@@, multiple MACs within an OLT are bound to a
 single XGMII, in case of a symmetric OLT, or to an XGMII transmit path and a GMII receive
 path, in case of an asymmetric OLT. Correspondingly, only one PLS_DATA.request
 primitive is active at any time.
 At the ONU, the MAC is either bound to an XGMII, in case of a symmetric ONU, or to an
 XGMII receive path and a GMII transmit path, in case of an asymmetric ONU."
Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 The Editor shall replace the indicated text as he does not know how to "Perlace"

Cl 76 SC 76.1.3 P100 L 15 # 2366
 Law, David 3Com
Comment Type E Comment Status D
 Paragraph 2 states 'At the ONU the MAC is either bound to an XGMII or to an XGMII
 receive path and a GMII transmit path.'
 Paragraph 3 then states 'For 10G links, the mechanism is extended to allow the MAC to be
 bound to a single XGMII, or to a GMII transmit path and an XGMII receive path (in the case
 of an asymmetric ONU) ..'
 Paragraph 3 seems to be a restatement of content in paragraph 2.
SuggestedRemedy
 Delete paragraph 3.
Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 See resolution from comment 2084.

Cl 76 SC 76.1.3.1 P100 L30 # 2085
 Kramer, Glen Teknovus, Inc.
Comment Type E Comment Status D
 grammar
SuggestedRemedy
 Insert commas after the "chip-to-chip" and "independence"
Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 76 SC 76.1.6 P101 L0 # 2307
 Hajduczenia, Marek Nokia Siemens Networ
Comment Type E Comment Status D
 Table 76-1 and Table 76-2 are affected. There are unusually large spaces between individual tables and blocks of surrounding text. Please remove extra spaces and align the Frame styles, if necessary.
SuggestedRemedy
 Please remove extra spaces between Table 76-1 and Table 76-2 and the accompanying text. Align Frame styles, if necessary.
Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Will beat on frame

Cl 76 SC 76.1.6 P101 L3 # 1775
 KIMURA, Mitsunobu Hitachi Communicatio
Comment Type E Comment Status D
 A period is missed.
SuggestedRemedy
 A period should be placed.
Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 76 SC 76.1.6 P101 L30 # 1726
 Lin, Rujian Shanghai Luster Terab
Comment Type T Comment Status D
 In Table 76-2, the following rows
 OLT Asymmetric(Rx:10Gb/s) XGMII RXD<31:0>,RXC<3:0>,RX_CLK
 ONU Asymmetric(Rx:1Gb/s) GMII RXD<7:0>,RX_ER,RX_DV,RX_CLK
 are incorrect.
SuggestedRemedy
 Correction:
 OLT Asymmetric(Rx:1Gb/s) GMII RXD<7:0>,RX_ER,RX_DV,RX_CLK
 ONU Asymmetric(Rx:10Gb/s) XGMII RXD<31:0>,RXC<3:0>,RX_CLK
Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 76 SC 76.1.6.1.3 P101 L6 # 2181
 Woodward, Ted Telcordia Technologie
Comment Type E Comment Status D *typo*
 repeated word '...bound the the XGMII'
SuggestedRemedy
 Substitute 'to' for duplicate word
Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 76 SC 76.1.6.1.3 P102 L5 # 2087
 Kramer, Glen Teknovus, Inc.
Comment Type E Comment Status D
 Use consistent primitive naming
SuggestedRemedy
 use PLS_CARRIER.indication (lower case "i")
Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 76 SC 76.2.1.1 P 106 L 26 # 2151
Lynskey, Eric Teknovus

Comment Type E Comment Status D

Figure 76-6 is incorrect. The box to the left of the PCS box should be labeled as the transmit function. The box to the right of the PCS box should be labeled as the receive function.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace with "10GBASE-PR Transmit Function" and "1000BASE-PX Receive function".

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 76 SC 76.2.1.2 P 107 L 20 # 1617
Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks

Comment Type E Comment Status D *typo*

Figure 76-8 includes two layers labelled "64/66b ENCODE" and "64/66b DECODE". These should be 64B/66B encode and decode.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "64/66b ENCODE" to "64B/66B ENCODE"
change "64/66b DECODE" to "64B/66B DECODE"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.
Moved to c76

Cl 76 SC 76.2.2 P 108 L 14 # 1619
Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks

Comment Type E Comment Status D *typo*

Figure 76-9 includes two layers labelled "64/66b DECODE" and "64/66b ENCODE". These should be 64B/66B encode and decode.

SuggestedRemedy

change "64/66b DECODE" to "64B/66B DECODE"
Change "64/66b ENCODE" to "64B/66B ENCODE"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.
Moved to c76

Cl 76 SC 76.2.2.1 P 108 L 38 # 2313
Hajduczenia, Marek Nokia Siemens Networ

Comment Type E Comment Status D

Why is IDLE DELETION process capitilized ? Idle Insertion or Carrier Sense was not ...

SuggestedRemedy

Change "IDLE DELETION" to "Idle Deletion" in all occurences.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 76 SC 76.2.2.1 P 108 L 49 # 1620
Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks

Comment Type E Comment Status D *typo*

"associated state variables as specific in Subclause 76.2.2.1.1." would be better as "associated state variables as specified in Subclause 76.2.2.1.1."

SuggestedRemedy

change "specific" to "specified"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.
Moved to c76

Cl 76 SC 76.2.2.1 P 108 L 49 # 2089
Kramer, Glen Teknovus, Inc.

Comment Type E Comment Status D *typo*

SuggestedRemedy

"specific" should be "specified"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 76 SC 76.2.2.4.1 P113 L17 # 1947
 Dawe, Piers Avago
 Comment Type T Comment Status D FEC_Formula
 If you need to use a capital pi
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add it to the table of symbols, return updated table to WG chair and vice-chair
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 76 SC 76.2.2.4.1 P113 L35 # 1957
 Dawe, Piers Avago
 Comment Type E Comment Status D
 "MSB bit": repetition
 SuggestedRemedy
 MSB
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 76 SC 76.2.2.4.1 P114 L7 # 1958
 Dawe, Piers Avago
 Comment Type E Comment Status D
 Strange characters after "Pad ,"
 SuggestedRemedy
 If you have found a way to import a drawing into Frame, please tell me! Fix the odd characters, 3 or 4 occurrences
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 76 SC 76.2.2.4.2 P114 L40 # 2316
 Hajduczenia, Marek Nokia Siemens Networ
 Comment Type E Comment Status D
 "padding bits to the 27 65-bit blocks" seems confusing when two numbers go after each other. Change to "padding bits to the 27 (twenty-seven) 65-bit blocks"
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change "padding bits to the 27 65-bit blocks" to "padding bits to the 27 (twenty-seven) 65-bit blocks"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 padding bits to the twenty-seven 65-bit blocks

Cl 76 SC 76.2.2.5 P117 L24 # 2124
 Lynskey, Eric Teknovus
 Comment Type T Comment Status D
 Figure 76-15 does not show the end of burst delimiter.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add end of burst delimiter to figure.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 76 SC 76.2.2.5 P117 L28 # 2318
 Hajduczenia, Marek Nokia Siemens Networ
 Comment Type E Comment Status D
 Figure 76-15 is affected. One of the captions on the figure says "First codeword starts with 2 66-bit blocks containing IDLE". It seems confusing when two numbers go after each other. Change the text to "First codeword starts with two 66-bit blocks containing IDLE"
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change "First codeword starts with 2 66-bit blocks containing IDLE" to "First codeword starts with two 66-bit blocks containing IDLE"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 76 SC 76.2.2.5 P117 L42 # 2093
 Kramer, Glen Teknovus, Inc.
 Comment Type T Comment Status D 0x55
 Synch pattern is not 0x55 anymore
 SuggestedRemedy
 1) remove text "0x55 (transmission bit sequence 1010...)"
 2) remove "(0x55...)" in Figure 76-15
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 See resolution to comment 2157

Cl 76 SC 76.2.2.5 P 118 L 1 # 2198
 Hirano, Kengo NEC Corporation

Comment Type T Comment Status D EOB

The ONU burst transmission ends with a burst terminator pattern of 3 blocks of all zeroes (see Figure 76-16).

SuggestedRemedy
 SuggestedRemedy:

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 See resolution to comment 2320

Cl 76 SC 76.2.2.5 P 118 L 1 # 1671
 Feng, Dongning Huawei Technologies

Comment Type T Comment Status D EOB

The end of burst delimiter pattern has been changed from all zeroes at the last meeting.

SuggestedRemedy
 Change "The ONU burst transmission ends with a burst terminator pattern of 3 blocks of all zeroes"
 To
 "The ONU burst transmission ends with a burst terminator pattern of 3 blocks of END_BURST_DELIMITER."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 See resolution to comment 2320

Cl 76 SC 76.2.2.5 P 118 L 12 # 2153
 Lynskey, Eric Teknovus

Comment Type T Comment Status D EOB

In Figure 76-16, the term "Burst Terminator" is not defined. It should try to match the actual names used by the state diagrams.

SuggestedRemedy
 Replace with End of Burst Delimiter.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Changed from "E" to "T"
 use "END_BURST_DELIMITER"
 See resolution to comment 2320

Cl 76 SC 76.2.2.5 P 118 L 25 # 1964
 Dawe, Piers Avago

Comment Type E Comment Status D

Subclause

SuggestedRemedy
 subclause

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 76 SC 76.2.2.5.1 P 118 L 41 # 2152
 Lynskey, Eric Teknovus

Comment Type E Comment Status D typo

Typo.

SuggestedRemedy
 Replace "transmissino" with "transmission."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 76 SC 76.2.2.5.2 P 119 L 13 # 2094
 Kramer, Glen Teknovus, Inc.

Comment Type E Comment Status D typo

Capitalization

SuggestedRemedy
 Capitalize D in detector

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 76 SC 76.2.2.5.2 P 119 L 35 # 2095
 Kramer, Glen Teknovus, Inc.

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Variable Transmitting is not ONU-specific. Change its description as shown in the remedy

SuggestedRemedy
 Use
 "Boolean variable indicating whether the device is transmitting or not. At the ONU, the default value of Transmitting is false. At the OLT, this variable is always set to true."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 76 SC 76.2.3.1.3 P125 L 41 # 181549
 Lynskey, Eric Teknovus
 Comment Type E Comment Status D resubmit
 Confusing notation here. We should use the special symbols and operators found on page 10.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace "<>" with "not equal to" symbol.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 Ctrl-q 9 Symbol
 == Resolution from Denver 0806 Meeting ==
 REJECT.
 This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter. To be resubmitted by TF Chair against next draft.
 Ctrl-q 9 Symbol
 =====

Cl 76 SC 76.2.3.2 P128 L 27 # 1624
 Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks
 Comment Type E Comment Status D typo
 Figure 76-20 contains the text "29 ,Au padding" which does not seem correct
 SuggestedRemedy
 should this be "29 "0" padding"?
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 Moved to c76

Cl 76 SC 76.2.3.2 P128 L 27 # 2323
 Hajduczenia, Marek Nokia Siemens Networ
 Comment Type E Comment Status D typo
 Figure 76-20 is affected. Strange characters in Figure "Pad 'Äú" around line 27 and 34
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace the corrupted text in Figure 76-20 with "Padding" or anything else that is deemed necessary (both occurrences).
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 76 SC 76.2.3.2 P128 L 33 # 2154
 Lynskey, Eric Teknovus
 Comment Type E Comment Status D typo
 Text in the first block of the FEC frame line has been corrupted.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace ",Au" with "0".
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 76 SC 76.2.3.2.3 P130 L 6 # 2324
 Hajduczenia, Marek Nokia Siemens Networ
 Comment Type E Comment Status D typo
 Space missing between Type and variable type for FEC_cnt variable.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace "Type:8 bit unsigned" with "Type: 8 bit unsigned"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 76 SC 76.2.3.3 P130 L 36 # 2182
 Woodward, Ted Telcordia Technologie
 Comment Type E Comment Status D
 Features discussed in Clause 45.2.1 related to FEC monitoring and statistics are not discussed in this section, and it seems like they should be.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Include discussion of FEC monitoring and reporting capabilities to be supported, or make reference thereto.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Add proper xref in 3rd para, ex.
 "If the decode_success is false, then a counter is incremented (see @@Subclause 45.2.1.88 through 45.2.1.89)."

Cl 76 SC 76.2.3.3 P130 L 46 # 1728
Lin, Rujian Shanghai Luster Terab

Comment Type E Comment Status D
transfers is lower then normal here. This is corrected in the idle insertion step

SuggestedRemedy

Correction: transfers is lower than normal here. This will be corrected in the idle insertion step

Proposed Response Response Status W
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 76 SC 76.2.3.3.3 P133 L 9 # 181550
Lynskey, Eric Teknovus

Comment Type E Comment Status D resubmit
Pseudo-code could be made easier to read.

SuggestedRemedy

Start "else" branch on new line.

Proposed Response Response Status W
PROPOSED ACCEPT.
== Resolution from Denver 0806 Meeting ==
REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter. To be resubmitted by TF Chair against next draft.

=====

Cl 76 SC 76.2.3.3.4 P133 L 20 # 1966
Dawe, Piers Avago

Comment Type T Comment Status D
Have some paragraphs got lost or mis-ordered? We have The body of this Subclause..." here and on the next page.

SuggestedRemedy

Per comment

Proposed Response Response Status W
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Remove duplicate text.

Cl 76 SC 76.2.3.3.4 P133 L 30 # 2098
Kramer, Glen Teknovus, Inc.

Comment Type T Comment Status D
State diagram in Figure 76-22 is missing transition "BEGIN"

SuggestedRemedy

Add this transition into INIT state

Proposed Response Response Status W
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 76 SC 76.2.3.4 P133 L 54 # 1627
Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks

Comment Type E Comment Status D numbering
Figures 76-23 and 76-24 seem to have been missed out. The numbering goes straight from 76-22 to 76-25

SuggestedRemedy

Renumber Figures 76-25 onwards.

Proposed Response Response Status W
PROPOSED ACCEPT.
Moved to c76

Cl 76 SC 76.2.3.4.4 P134 L 51 # 1729
Lin, Rujian Shanghai Luster Terab

Comment Type E Comment Status D typo
The BER Monitor

SuggestedRemedy

Correction: The BER Monitor

Proposed Response Response Status W
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 76 SC 76.2.3.7 P136 L 8 # 1730
Lin, Rujian Shanghai Luster Terab

Comment Type E Comment Status D typo
in the same locations

SuggestedRemedy

Correction: at the same locations

Proposed Response Response Status W
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 76 **SC 76.2.3.7.1** **P 136** **L 24** # 2326
Hajduczenia, Marek Nokia Siemens Network

Comment Type E **Comment Status D** *typo*

Space missing between "Subclause" and "76.2.2.1.1". Insert the space as necessary.

SuggestedRemedy
Change "Subclause76.2.2.1.1" to "Subclause 76.2.2.1.1"

Proposed Response **Response Status W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 76 **SC 76.2.3.7.2** **P 136** **L 31** # 2100
Kramer, Glen Teknovus, Inc.

Comment Type TR **Comment Status D**

input and output processes of Idle Insertion have been combined into one, but the description of FIFO_II has not been updated.

SuggestedRemedy
replace this text:
"This FIFO is internal to the Idle Insertion function and is shared by input on output processes of Idle Insertion. Upon initialization, all elements of this array are set to contain 72-bit vectors representing // characters. FIFO_II is a zero-based array of size sufficient to hold maximum size frame."

with this text:

"This FIFO is internal to the Idle Insertion process. Upon initialization, all elements of this array are set to contain 72-bit vectors representing // characters. FIFO_II is a zero-based array of size FIFO_II_SIZE (See 76.2.3.7.1)."

Proposed Response **Response Status W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 76 **SC 76.2.3.7.2** **P 136** **L 53** # 2033
Kramer, Glen Teknovus, Inc.

Comment Type T **Comment Status D**

1) Definition of variable VectorCount is missing
2) Variable RxVecorCount is defined, but not used in state diagram

SuggestedRemedy
1) Remove definition of RxVectorCount
2) Add definition of VectorCount, as shown below:

VectorCount
TYPE: 16-bit unsigned
This variable tracks the number of of 72-bit vectors stored in the FIFO_II.

Proposed Response **Response Status W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 76 **SC 76.2.3.7.5** **P 137** **L 21** # 2133
Lynskey, Eric Teknovus

Comment Type T **Comment Status D**

There is no PICS for this shall statement.

SuggestedRemedy
Item,
Idle insertion,
76.2.3.7.5,
Meets the requirements of Figure 76-26,
M,
Yes[] No[]

Proposed Response **Response Status W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 76 **SC 76.3** **P 137** **L 24** # 2382
Law, David 3Com

Comment Type T **Comment Status D**

Suggest that the title of this subclause would be clearer if it simply read '10GBASE-PR and 10/1GBASE-PRX PMA' since this is in fact what is defined by this subclause and its subclauses, also the current title doesn't say what PMA this is the extensions to.

SuggestedRemedy
Change 'Extensions to PMA for 10GBASE-PR and 10/1GBASE-PRX' to read '10GBASE-PR and 10/1GBASE-PRX PMA'.

Proposed Response **Response Status W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 76 **SC 76.3** **P 137** **L 28** # 2383
Law, David 3Com

Comment Type **T** **Comment Status** **D**

State where the 1000BASE-PX PMA specification is found, also typo.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the text '.. and 1000BASEPX, as shown in Table 76-5.' to read '.. and 1000BASE-PX defined is subclause 65.3.2, as shown in Table 76-5.'

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

.. And 1000BASE-PX defined in Subclause @@65.3.2@@, as shown in Table 76-5.

Cl 76 **SC 76.3** **P 137** **L 28** # 2327
Hajduczenia, Marek Nokia Siemens Networ

Comment Type **E** **Comment Status** **D** *typo*

Incorrect PMD name. There is no 1000BASEPX PMD. Change to "1000BASE-PX"

SuggestedRemedy

Change "1000BASEPX" to "1000BASE-PX"

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 76 **SC 76.3** **P 137** **L 29** # 2035
Kramer, Glen Teknovus, Inc.

Comment Type **E** **Comment Status** **D** *typo*

Typo

SuggestedRemedy

1000BASEPX should be 1000BASE-PX

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 76 **SC 76.3** **P 137** **L 29** # 1731
Lin, Rujian Shanghai Luster Terab

Comment Type **E** **Comment Status** **D** *typo*

1000BASEPX

SuggestedRemedy

Correction: 1000BASE-PX

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 76 **SC 76.3** **P 137** **L 39** # 2360
Law, David 3Com

Comment Type **E** **Comment Status** **D**

Suggest that 'As specified in Clause 51 with extensions defined in @@76.3.1@@ below' in the receive function column should be changed to read 'Identical to 10GBASE-PR-U. This parallels the text used in the Transmit function two lines below.

SuggestedRemedy

See comment.

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 76 **SC 76.3** **P 137** **L 40** # 2036
Kramer, Glen Teknovus, Inc.

Comment Type **T** **Comment Status** **D** *table 76-5 r3*

Wrong PMA name in table 76-5, on line 40

SuggestedRemedy

10GBASE-PR-U should be 10GBASE-PR-D

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

3rd row of table (not including headers)

Cl 76 **SC 76.3** **P 137** **L 40** # 2300
Hajduczenia, Marek Nokia Siemens Networ

Comment Type **T** **Comment Status** **D** *table 76-5 r3*

In Table 76-5, the Line 3 of the column "PMA" should contain "10GBASE-PR-D" and not "10GBASE-PR-U"

SuggestedRemedy

Replace "10GBASE-PR-U" with "10GBASE-PR-D" in Table 76-5, Line 3 of column "PMA".

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 76 **SC 76.3** **P 137** **L 40** # 2381
 Law, David 3Com

Comment Type **T** **Comment Status** **D** *table 76-5 r3*

The 10GBASE-PR-U PHY is already covered by the first line of Table 76-5 so I think this line should read 10GBASE-PR-D.

SuggestedRemedy
 Change '10GBASE-PR-U' to read '10GBASE-PR-D'.

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 76 **SC 76.3.1.1** **P 137** **L 52** # 2037
 Kramer, Glen Teknovus, Inc.

Comment Type **E** **Comment Status** **D**

definition on PMD_SIGNAL.request(tx_enable) is broken across two pages.

SuggestedRemedy
 There should be a setting in Framemaker to keep lines of a paragraph together. Either use this setting, or insert blank lines to move the line "PMD_SIGNAL.request(tx_enable)" to the next page

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 76 **SC 76.3.1.1** **P 138** **L 42** # 2328
 Hajduczenia, Marek Nokia Siemens Networ

Comment Type **ER** **Comment Status** **D**

Text "It is generated by the PCS's data detector (see 75)" seems to have incomplete reference. Which subclause is meant in here ? Probably data detector subclause in Clause 76 should be referenced (76.2.2.5) though it is not clear.

SuggestedRemedy
 Fix the incomplete reference in this line. Probably data detector subclause in Clause 76 should be referenced (76.2.2.5) though it is not clear.

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 76 **SC 76.3.2.1.1** **P 139** **L 20** # 1628
 Anslow, Peter Nortel Networks

Comment Type **E** **Comment Status** **D**

This says "@@Figure 75-3@@ and @@Figure 75-4@@ illustrate the tests setup for the OLT PMA receiver (upstream) TCDR time." but Figures 75-3 and 75-4 are just the block diagrams of 10GBASE-PR and 10GBASE-PRX

SuggestedRemedy
 If these are the correct figures then change the text to: "The OLT PMA receiver (upstream) TCDR time is measured in an arrangement as shown in Figure 75-3 and Figure 75-4."

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 [Moved to C76]
 [Clause and subclause number was added]

Cl 76 **SC 76.3.2.1.1** **P 139** **L 20** # 2039
 Kramer, Glen Teknovus, Inc.

Comment Type **E** **Comment Status** **D** *typo*

typo

SuggestedRemedy
 "tests" should be "test"

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 And setup should be setups.

Cl 76 **SC 76.3.2.1.1** **P 139** **L 33** # 2184
 Woodward, Ted Telcordia Technologie

Comment Type **E** **Comment Status** **D**

colon is followed by new paragraph. It's not clear if there is some content missing or this was a formatting error.

SuggestedRemedy
 adjust formatting or content appropriately.

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Change para to:
 "A non-rigorous way to describe this test setup would be to use an ONU transmitter PMD with a known Ton time and an OLT receiver PMD with a known Treceiver_settling time."

Cl 76 **SC 76.4** **P 140** **L 1** # 2040
Kramer, Glen Teknovus, Inc.

Comment Type **T** **Comment Status** **D**
No point of listing every single PMD subtype in the subclause title

SuggestedRemedy
Use

"76.4 Protocol implementation conformance statement (PICS) proforma for Clause 76, Reconciliation Sublayer (RS), Physical Coding Sublayer (PCS), and Physical Media Attachment (PMA) for point-to-multipoint media, types 10GBASE-PR and 10/1GBASE-PRX"

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.
Gladly

Cl 76 **SC 76.4.2.2** **P 141** **L 5** # 2042
Kramer, Glen Teknovus, Inc.

Comment Type **T** **Comment Status** **D**
Incorrect clause name

SuggestedRemedy
"point-to-point" should be "point-to-multipoint"

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 76 **SC 76.4.3** **P 141** **L 27** # 2041
Kramer, Glen Teknovus, Inc.

Comment Type **E** **Comment Status** **D**
Inconsistent item names

*FEC Encoder and *FEC-Decoder

SuggestedRemedy
Either use hyphen or not in both cases

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.
See resolution to comment 2113

Cl 76 **SC 76.4.3** **P 141** **L 27** # 1969
Dawe, Piers Avago

Comment Type **E** **Comment Status** **D**
76.1.2.4

SuggestedRemedy
76.2.2.4

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.
Also see comment 2113

Cl 76 **SC 76.4.3** **P 141** **L 29** # 1970
Dawe, Piers Avago

Comment Type **E** **Comment Status** **D**
76.2.3.2

SuggestedRemedy
76.2.3.3

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.
Also see comment 2113

Cl 76 **SC 76.4.4.4** **P 143** **L 12** # 2108
Lynskey, Eric Teknovus

Comment Type **E** **Comment Status** **D**
Reference in item DD2 is incorrect.

SuggestedRemedy
Replace with 76.2.2.5.4.

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl	SC	P	L	#
76	76.4.4.4	143	14	2129
Lynskey, Eric		Teknovus		
<i>Comment Type</i>	T	<i>Comment Status</i>	D	
There is no PICS item for the OLT data detector, and only one state diagram is mentioned for the ONU data detector.				
<i>SuggestedRemedy</i>				
Replace item DD3 and add item DD4:				
DD3, ONU State diagrams, 76.2.2.5.6, Meets the requirements of Figure 76-17 and Figure 76-18b. ONU:M, Yes[] No[]				
DD4, OLT State diagrams, 76.2.2.5.6, Meets the requirements of Figure 76-17 and Figure 76-18a. OLT:M, Yes[] No[]				
<i>Proposed Response</i>	<i>Response Status</i>		W	
PROPOSED ACCEPT.				

Cl	SC	P	L	#
76	76.4.4.5	143	21	2044
Kramer, Glen		Teknovus, Inc.		
<i>Comment Type</i>	T	<i>Comment Status</i>	D	
Incorrect PICs requirement				
"If the minimum IPG was transmitted after a frame, then 4 IDLE control character are deleted for every 27 vectors transmitted."				
We delete 4 vectors containing idles, not 4 idles. This has been corrected in clause text, but is missed in PICS.				
<i>SuggestedRemedy</i>				
replace				
"If the minimum IPG was transmitted after a frame, then 4 IDLE control character are deleted for every 27 vectors transmitted."				
with				
"If the minimum IPG was transmitted after a frame, then 4 vectors containing IDLE control character are deleted for every 27 vectors transmitted."				
<i>Proposed Response</i>	<i>Response Status</i>		W	
PROPOSED ACCEPT.				

Cl	SC	P	L	#
76	76.4.4.5	143	22	2128
Lynskey, Eric		Teknovus		
<i>Comment Type</i>	T	<i>Comment Status</i>	D	
There is no associated "shall" requirement for PICS item AIC1. We either need to add a requirement or should remove the PICS item. Also, it is not clear what this item is trying to describe. It is an ONU specific item, but the only ONU specific function in this block of text refers to the alignment of the start character. It seems that the behavior described by this item should be fully covered by compliance with the state machine, and therefore this item is not necessary.				
<i>SuggestedRemedy</i>				
Remove item AIC1.				
<i>Proposed Response</i>	<i>Response Status</i>		W	
PROPOSED ACCEPT.				

Cl 76 SC 76.4.4.5 P 143 L 27 # 2043
 Kramer, Glen Teknovus, Inc.
 Comment Type T Comment Status D
 Incorrect function name (in two places)
 SuggestedRemedy
 "Idle Detection" should be 'Idle Deletion"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 76 SC 76.4.4.6 P 143 L 41 # 2112
 Lynskey, Eric Teknovus
 Comment Type E Comment Status D
 Subclause reference is incorrect for PICS item FE2.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace with 76.2.3.3.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 76 SC 76.4.4.7 P 144 L 5 # 2045
 Kramer, Glen Teknovus, Inc.
 Comment Type T Comment Status D
 Missing clause number for item SM1
 SuggestedRemedy
 Use 76.2.2.4
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 See resolution to 2132 & 2134

Cl 76 SC 76.4.4.9 P 144 L 27 # 2046
 Kramer, Glen Teknovus, Inc.
 Comment Type T Comment Status D TQ Delay
 "Combined delay variation through RS, PCS, and PMA sublayers is limited to 16 bit times"
 The clause text specified this delay variability as 1 TQ. 1 time_quantum is 160 bit times, not 16, as it was in 1G EPON.
 AAlso note that another comment suggested to make this time bigger.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace "16 bit times" with "1 time_quantum"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 See resolution to 2126

Cl 76A SC P 152 L # 2048
 Kramer, Glen Teknovus, Inc.
 Comment Type E Comment Status D
 Empty page at the end of Annex 76A
 SuggestedRemedy
 Remove empty page
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Moved to 76A
 Frame is as frame is, will try.

Cl 76A SC 3 P 145 L 47 # 1787
 KIMURA, Mitsunobu Hitachi Communicatio
 Comment Type E Comment Status D
 A word "ie." is shown. Maybe "i.e." is more correct.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Should be "i.e."
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 See resolution to comment 2047

CI 76A **SC 6** **P 149** **L 2** # 1788
 KIMURA, Mitsunobu Hitachi Communicatio

Comment Type E **Comment Status D**
 A word "ie." is shown. Maybe "i.e." is more correct.

SuggestedRemedy
 Should be "i.e."

Proposed Response **Response Status W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 See resolution to comment 2047

CI 76A **SC 6** **P 149** **L 6** # 1789
 KIMURA, Mitsunobu Hitachi Communicatio

Comment Type E **Comment Status D** *typo*
 In the title of Table 76A-4, two spaces are shown between "parity octets".

SuggestedRemedy
 Should be "parity octets" (one space between the words).

Proposed Response **Response Status W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 76A **SC 7** **P 150** **L 2** # 1790
 KIMURA, Mitsunobu Hitachi Communicatio

Comment Type E **Comment Status D**
 In L2 and L38, a word "ie." is shown. Maybe "i.e." is more correct.

SuggestedRemedy
 Should be "i.e."

Proposed Response **Response Status W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 See resolution to comment 2047

CI 76A **SC 76A.3** **P 146** **L 1** # 2329
 Hajduczenia, Marek Nokia Siemens Networ

Comment Type E **Comment Status D**
 Why is this line of text separated from the remainder of the block on page 145 ? Switch the orphan control off.

SuggestedRemedy
 Move line 1 on page 146 back to page 145.

Proposed Response **Response Status W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Will beat on frame.

CI 77 **SC 77.1.2** **P 154** **L 52** # 1998
 Brown, Alan Wave7 Optics, Inc.

Comment Type E **Comment Status D**
 References to figures should not include period. There are multiple similar references throughout this section. Similar figure references in this document use unique numeric only figure identifiers.

SuggestedRemedy
 Preferred remedy is to use distinct figure numbers, as in "Figure 77-2" and "Figure 77-3". Failing that, use figure references without period, as in "Figure 77-2a" and "Figure 77-2b" because that is what the figures themselves use.

Proposed Response **Response Status W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 77 **SC 77.1.5** **P 159** **L 30** # 2185
 Woodward, Ted Telcordia Technologie

Comment Type E **Comment Status D**
 Seems like a typo "!(a<b or a-b)" and similarly on the following two lines.

SuggestedRemedy
 Correct extra '!' in these 3 lines

Proposed Response **Response Status W**
 PROPOSED REJECT.
 [Subclause number was fixed]
 [Page number was fixed]
 Statements are logically correct.

CI 77 **SC 77.2.1** **P 161** **L 1** # 2049
 Kramer, Glen Teknovus, Inc.

Comment Type E **Comment Status D**
 Two separate bullet lists have continuous numbering

SuggestedRemedy
 Restart bullet numbering for the transmit operation

Proposed Response **Response Status W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 [Page number was fixed]

CI 77 SC 77.2.2 P 163 L 14 # 1792
 KIMURA, Mitsunobu Hitachi Communicatio

Comment Type E Comment Status D
 Between the words "ONU the", a comma is needed.

SuggestedRemedy
 Should be "ONU, the".

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 [Subclause number was fixed]

CI 77 SC 77.2.2 P 163 L 30 # 2137
 Lynskey, Eric Teknovus

Comment Type T Comment Status D 1A_DATA.request parameters
 In some figures, such as Figure 77-15, the MA_DATA.request primitive is shown with its parameters. In other figures, such as Figure 77-6, no parameters are shown. A consistent method should be decided upon.

SuggestedRemedy
 Show parameters in the following figures: 77-3, 77-6, 77-7, 77-8,

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 77 SC 77.2.27 P 172 L 18 # 2338
 Hajduczenia, Marek Nokia Siemens Networ

Comment Type E Comment Status D Figure 77-11 is bold
 Figure 77-11 is affected. In state PARSE TIMESTAMP, the first line of code seems to be bold.

SuggestedRemedy
 Unbold it :)

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 77 SC 77.2.27 P 172 L 18 # 2050
 Kramer, Glen Teknovus, Inc.

Comment Type E Comment Status D Figure 77-11 is bold
 In state diagram in Figure 77-11, in state PARSE TIMESTAMP, the first line of code looks bold.

SuggestedRemedy
 Check and unbold

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 See comment #2338

CI 77 SC 77.3.2.3 P 176 L 27 # 181541
 Remein, Duane Alcatel-Lucent

Comment Type E Comment Status D
 Invalid reference @@76.1.2.3.3.2@@

SuggestedRemedy
 Change to:
 @@76.1.6.2.3.2@@

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Change to "76.1.6.2.3.2". Make sure the link is live

== Resolution from Denver 0806 Meeting ==
 REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter. To be resubmitted by TF Chair against next draft.

Resubmit

=====

CI 77 SC 77.3.3 P 177 L 10 # 2051
 Kramer, Glen Teknovus, Inc.

Comment Type E Comment Status D
 grammar

SuggestedRemedy
 "on" should be "of"

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 77 SC 77.3.3 P 177 L 25 # 2052
Kramer, Glen Teknovus, Inc.

Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **D** Figure 77-22 accompanying text

"Note that the echoed parameter values i.e. required OLT synchronization time and laser on/off times are delivered to the registering ONU for confirmation purposes only and their utilization is not prescribed in this specification."

This sentence is technically incorrect. According to the state diagram in Figure 77-22, the ONU should use the syncTime value it receives in the REGISTER message, even if this value is different from what it was in the discovery GATE. Same for laser on/off time.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete this sentence to be consistent with the state machine.

Proposed Response Response Status **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 77 SC 77.3.3 P 177 L 25 # 2334
Hajduczenia, Marek Nokia Siemens Networ

Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **D** Figure 77-22 accompanying text

Description of the Discovery Process is inconsistent with the actual state diagram behaviour. The text "Note that the echoed parameter values i.e. required OLT synchronization time and laser on/off times are delivered to the registering ONU for confirmation purposes only and their utilization is not prescribed in this specification." does not make sense since the said parameter s are parsed in the state diagram and used (e.g. syncTime value as per Figure 77-22). The same applies to laserOn / laserOff times

SuggestedRemedy

Delete the offending sentence.

Proposed Response Response Status **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.
See comment #2052

CI 77 SC 77.3.3 P 177 L 3 # 1732
Lin, Rujian Shanghai Luster Terab

Comment Type **E** Comment Status **D**

where multiple ONUs can access the PON simultaneously,

SuggestedRemedy

Correction: when multiple ONUs can access the PON simultaneously,

Proposed Response Response Status **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 77 SC 77.3.3 P 179 L 1 # 2332
Hajduczenia, Marek Nokia Siemens Networ

Comment Type **T** Comment Status **D** IA_DATA.request parameters

Figure 77-15 contains MA_DATA.request primitive with parameters, while other figures, e.g. Figure 77-6 contains no parameters. One method of presentation should be selected and used consistently throughout the clause.

SuggestedRemedy

Decide if MA_DATA.request primitive is to be used with parameters or without them and use it consistently through the whole clause.

Proposed Response Response Status **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
See comment #2137

CI 77 SC 77.3.3.5 P 183 L 19 # 2114
Lynskey, Eric Teknovus

Comment Type **E** Comment Status **D**

Unnecessary shall statement. Statements with the word "shall" should be reserved for requirements. There is no need to apply the shall to only one of the parameters of the message.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace with "...and speed(s) at which the registration attempt is made."

Proposed Response Response Status **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 77 SC 77.3.3.5 P 183 L 34 # 1793
KIMURA, Mitsunobu Hitachi Communicatio

Comment Type **E** Comment Status **D**

"Discovery Process is in the OLT." of "is" not needed in this sentence.

SuggestedRemedy

Should be "Discovery Process in the OLT."

Proposed Response Response Status **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.
[Subclause number was fixed]

Cl 77 **SC 77.3.3.5** **P 184** **L 49** # 1795
 KIMURA, Mitsunobu Hitachi Communicatio

Comment Type **E** **Comment Status** **D**
 A period (".") is missed.

SuggestedRemedy
 Should be "is in the OLT."

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 [Subclause number was fixed]

Cl 77 **SC 77.3.3.6** **P 186** **L 19** # 2301
 Hajduczenia, Marek Nokia Siemens Networ

Comment Type **TR** **Comment Status** **D**
 As shown in Figure 77-19, discoveryInformation, laserOnTime and laserOffTime should be parsed from data_rx instead of data_tx.

SuggestedRemedy
 In Figure 77-19:
 (1) change "discoveryInformation <= data_tx[64:79]" to "discoveryInformation <= data_rx[64:79]"
 (2) change "laserOnTime <= data_tx[80:87]" to "laserOnTime <= data_rx[80:87]"
 (3) change "laserOffTime <= data_tx[88:95]" to "laserOffTime <= data_rx[88:95]"

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 77 **SC 77.3.4.5** **P 191** **L 18** # 1796
 KIMURA, Mitsunobu Hitachi Communicatio

Comment Type **E** **Comment Status** **D**
 Sentences of L18 and L19 are not placed properly. These explain "report_list".

SuggestedRemedy
 Sentences of L18 and L19 should be placed right after L17.

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 [Subclause number was fixed]
 L18 and L19 will be aligned with L17.

Cl 77 **SC 77.3.5.2** **P 194** **L 49** # 2116
 Lynskey, Eric Teknovus

Comment Type **E** **Comment Status** **D**
 Typo.

SuggestedRemedy
 Replace "date" with "data".

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 77 **SC 77.3.6** **P 200** **L 2** # 2054
 Kramer, Glen Teknovus, Inc.

Comment Type **E** **Comment Status** **D**
 wrong order of words

SuggestedRemedy
 "shown as" should be "as shown"

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 77 **SC 77.3.6.1** **P 202** **L 1** # 2336
 Hajduczenia, Marek Nokia Siemens Networ

Comment Type **E** **Comment Status** **D** *Table 77-3 and Table 77-4 order*
 Table 77-3 should go after Table 77-4, which is referred to in text first.

SuggestedRemedy
 Place Table 77-3 after Table 77-4 and replace their numbers accordingly.

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 77 **SC 77.3.6.1** **P 202** **L 11** # 1734
 Lin, Rujian Shanghai Luster Terab

Comment Type E **Comment Status D**

Paragraphs:
 c) Grant #n Length.
 d) Grant #n Start Time.

SuggestedRemedy

Propose to inter-change the order of the two paragraphs as:
 c) Grant #n Start Time.
 d) Grant #n Length.
 according the order of GATE MPCPDU from top to bottom

Proposed Response **Response Status W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 [Page number was fixed]
 Lines 11 through 15 are affected

Cl 77 **SC 77.3.6.1** **P 202** **L 18** # 2335
 Hajduczenia, Marek Nokia Siemens Networ

Comment Type TR **Comment Status D** **Sync Time in REGISTER**

Invalid description of the SyncTime in the GATE MPCPDU description. The text " During the synchronization time the ONU shall send a synchronization pattern of 0x55 (transmission bit sequence 1010 ...) followed by a burst delimiter and idle blocks as defined in @@Subclause 76.2.3.5@@" is not correct any more since the synchronization pattern was altered. See 76.2.3.5 for correct sync pattern.

SuggestedRemedy

Modify the sentence "During the synchronization time the ONU shall send a synchronization pattern of 0x55 (transmission bit sequence 1010 ...) followed by a burst delimiter and idle blocks as defined in @@Subclause 76.2.3.5@@" to read "During the synchronization time the ONU shall send a synchronization pattern followed by a burst delimiter and idle blocks as defined in @@Subclause 76.2.3.5@@".

Proposed Response **Response Status W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 See comment #2056

Cl 77 **SC 77.3.6.1** **P 202** **L 3** # 2055
 Kramer, Glen Teknovus, Inc.

Comment Type E **Comment Status D**

Missing hyphen

line 3: "8 bit flag"
 line 11: "16 bit unsigned field"
 line 15: "32 bit unsigned field."
 line 18: "16 bit value"
 line 25: "16 bit flag"

Also on page 206
 line 6: "8 bit flag"
 line 7: "8 bit value"
 line 10: "16 bit flag"

SuggestedRemedy

The above should be:

line 3: "8-bit flag"
 line 11: "16-bit unsigned field"
 line 15: "32-bit unsigned field."
 line 18: "16-bit value"
 line 25: "16-bit flag"

Also on page 206
 line 6: "8-bit flag"
 line 7: "8-bit value"
 line 10: "16-bit flag"

Proposed Response **Response Status W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 77 **SC 77.3.6.1** **P 202** **L 33** # 2057
 Kramer, Glen Teknovus, Inc.

Comment Type E **Comment Status D**

Sentence is difficult to read:

"The GATE MPCPDU shall be generated by a MAC Control instance mapped to an active ONU, and as such shall be marked with a unicast type of LLID, except when the discovery flag is set where the MAC Control instance is mapped to all ONUs and such frame is marked by the appropriate broadcast LLID (Subclause 77.3.2.3)."

SuggestedRemedy

Split into two sentences, as shown below:

"The GATE MPCPDU shall be generated by a MAC Control instance mapped to an active ONU, and as such shall be marked with a unicast type of LLID, except when the MPCPDU is a discovery GATE, as indicated by the discovery flag being set to true. For the discovery procedure, a MAC Control instance is mapped to all ONUs, and therefore the discovery GATE MPCPDU is marked with the appropriate broadcast LLID (Subclause 77.3.2.3)."

Proposed Response **Response Status W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

"The GATE MPCPDU shall be generated by a MAC Control instance mapped to an active ONU, and as such shall be marked with a unicast type of LLID, except when the MPCPDU is a discovery GATE, as indicated by the discovery flag being set to true. For the discovery procedure, a MAC Control instance is mapped to all ONUs, and therefore, the discovery GATE MPCPDU is marked with the appropriate broadcast LLID (see 77.3.2.3)."

Cl 77 **SC 77.3.6.1** **P 202** **L 38** # 1735
 Lin, Rujian Shanghai Luster Terab

Comment Type E **Comment Status D** *Table 77-3 and Table 77-4 order*

Table 77-3--GATE MPCPDU Discovery Information Fields

SuggestedRemedy

Changed to:
 Table 77-4--GATE MPCPDU Discovery Information Fields

Proposed Response **Response Status W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 See comment #2336

Cl 77 **SC 77.3.6.1** **P 202** **L 4** # 1733
 Lin, Rujian Shanghai Luster Terab

Comment Type E **Comment Status D**

The Number of grants field

SuggestedRemedy

Modified to:
 As presented in Table 77-3, the Number of grants field

Proposed Response **Response Status W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 Make sure it is implemented together with comment #2336

Cl 77 **SC 77.3.6.1** **P 202** **L 5** # 1797
 KIMURA, Mitsunobu Hitachi Communicatio

Comment Type E **Comment Status D**

"valid Length, Start Time pairs" is shown. The comma could be replaced as "and".

SuggestedRemedy

Should be "valid Length and Start Time pairs".

Proposed Response **Response Status W**

PROPOSED REJECT.
 [Subclause number was fixed]
 Pairs of parameters are typically represented using a comma.

Cl 77 **SC 77.3.6.1** **P 203** **L 1** # 1736
 Lin, Rujian Shanghai Luster Terab

Comment Type E **Comment Status D** *Table 77-3 and Table 77-4 order*

Table 77-4--GATE MPCPDU Number of Grants/Flags Fields

SuggestedRemedy

Changed to:
 Table 77-3--GATE MPCPDU Number of Grants/Flags Fields

According the order of Gate MPCPDU from top to bottom. It is better to position Table 77-3--GATE MPCPDU Number of Grants/Flags Fields prior to Table 77-4--GATE MPCPDU Discovery Information Fields.

Proposed Response **Response Status W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 See comment #2336

CI 77 SC 77.3.6.2 P 204 L 8 # 2121
Lynskey, Eric Teknovus

Comment Type T Comment Status D
Several meetings ago, we decided to let the OLT calculate FEC overhead and let the ONU report data and IPG, rounded up to the nearest TQ. We should be more explicit on defining this mechanism.

SuggestedRemedy
"The reported length shall be adjusted and rounded up to the nearest time_quantum to account for the necessary inter-frame spacing and preamble. FEC overhead is not included in the reported length."

Proposed Response Response Status W
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

"The reported length shall be adjusted and rounded up to the nearest time_quantum to account for the necessary inter-frame spacing and preamble. FEC parity overhead is not included in the reported length."

CI 77 SC 77.3.6.3 P 206 L 6 # 1737
Lin, Rujian Shanghai Luster Terab

Comment Type E Comment Status D
b)Flags.....for the registration.

SuggestedRemedy
Modified to:
b)Flags.....for the registration, as presented in Table 77-6.

Proposed Response Response Status W
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 77 SC 77.3.6.4 P 207 L 47 # 1738
Lin, Rujian Shanghai Luster Terab

Comment Type E Comment Status D
d) Flags. this is..... for the registration.

SuggestedRemedy
Modified to
d) Flags. This is..... for the registration, as presented in Table 77-8.

Proposed Response Response Status W
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 77 SC 77.3.6.5 P 209 L 21 # 1739
Lin, Rujian Shanghai Luster Terab

Comment Type E Comment Status D
b) Flags. This is.....for the registration. Echoed assigned port. This field holds a 16 bit unsigned value reflecting the LLID for the port assigned following registration.
c) Echoed Sync Time. This is
d) Pad/Reserved. This is.....

SuggestedRemedy
modified to:
b) Flags. This is.....for the registration, as presented in Table 77-9.
c) Echoed assigned port. This field holds a 16 bit unsigned value reflecting the LLID for the port assigned following registration.
d) Echoed Sync Time. This is
e) Pad/Reserved. This is.....

Proposed Response Response Status W
PROPOSED ACCEPT.
[Page number was fixed]
Lines 21 - 27 are affected

CI 77 SC 77.4.1 P 210 L 38 # 2060
Kramer, Glen Teknovus, Inc.

Comment Type E Comment Status D
Speed-specific should have a hyphen

SuggestedRemedy
Add on lines 38, 42, and line 44 on page 211

Proposed Response Response Status W
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 77 SC 77.4.1 P 210 L 43 # 1740
Lin, Rujian Shanghai Luster Terab

Comment Type E Comment Status D
that may co-exist on the same PON.

SuggestedRemedy
Correction:
that may co-exist in the same PON.

Proposed Response Response Status W
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 77 SC 77.4.1 P 211 L 27 # 2061
 Kramer, Glen Teknovus, Inc.
 Comment Type T Comment Status D Figure 77-36 changes
 Figure 77-36 is not very clear.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add a sub-caption to each diagram:
 (a) Discovery window opened for 1 Gb/s upstream transmissions
 (b) Discovery window opened for 10 Gb/s upstream transmissions
 (c) Discovery window opened for 1 Gb/s and 10Gb/s upstream transmissions
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 See comment #2337

CI 77 SC 77.4.1 P 211 L 40 # 1743
 Lin, Rujian Shanghai Luster Terab
 Comment Type E Comment Status D
 Figure 77-36--Combinations of.....coexisting on the same PON.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Modified to:
 Figure 77-36--Combinations of.....coexisting in the same PON.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 [Page number was fixed]

CI 77 SC 77.4.2 P 211 L 45 # 1744
 Lin, Rujian Shanghai Luster Terab
 Comment Type E Comment Status D
 transmitted by the OLT on the 1 Gb/s broadcast channel.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Modified to:
 transmitted by the OLT in the 1 Gb/s broadcast channel.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 [Page number was fixed]

CI 77 SC 77.4.2 P 211 L 47 # 2069
 Kramer, Glen Teknovus, Inc.
 Comment Type T Comment Status D Clause 64 reference in Clause 77
 "Operation and registration of these ONUs remains the same as previously, since no changes have been made to the existing 1 Gb/s discovery process."
 It may be unclear to readers what "previously" means.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change this sentence to:
 "Operation and registration of these ONUs is defined in Clause 64."
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 See comment #2339

CI 77 SC 77.4.2 P 211 L 50 # 1745
 Lin, Rujian Shanghai Luster Terab
 Comment Type E Comment Status D
 transmitted by the OLT on the 10 Gb/s broadcast channel.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Modified to:
 transmitted by the OLT in the 10 Gb/s broadcast channel.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 [Page number was fixed]

CI 77 SC 77.4.2 P 211 L 51 # 2062
 Kramer, Glen Teknovus, Inc.
 Comment Type E Comment Status D
 "These messages need to be parsed..."
 This sentence is ambiguous. Messages need to be parsed, but are not? If they are parsed, say so.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace with "These messages are parsed..."
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 77 **SC 77.4.2** **P211** **L 52** # 1746
 Lin, Rujian Shanghai Luster Terab

Comment Type **E** **Comment Status** **D**
 the ONU may attempt to register on the EPON.

SuggestedRemedy
 Modified to:
 the ONU may attempt to register in the EPON.

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 77 **SC 77.4.2** **P212** **L 2** # 1747
 Lin, Rujian Shanghai Luster Terab

Comment Type **E** **Comment Status** **D**
 transmitted by the OLT on the 10 Gb/s broadcast channel.

SuggestedRemedy
 Modified to:
 transmitted by the OLT in the 10 Gb/s broadcast channel.

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 77 **SC 77.4.2** **P212** **L 4** # 2065
 Kramer, Glen Teknovus, Inc.

Comment Type **E** **Comment Status** **D**
 typo

SuggestedRemedy
 Remove word "based" in

"The ONU should attempt to register based during the discovery window announced as supporting the highest speed common to both the OLT and ONU."

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 77 **SC 77.4.2** **P212** **L 4** # 1748
 Lin, Rujian Shanghai Luster Terab

Comment Type **E** **Comment Status** **D**
 The ONU should attempt to register based during the discovery window.....

SuggestedRemedy
 Correction:
 The ONU should attempt to register during the discovery window.....

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 See comment #1748

Cl 77 **SC 77.5.4.1** **P214** **L 27** # 2067
 Kramer, Glen Teknovus, Inc.

Comment Type **T** **Comment Status** **D**
 The PICS comment should be clarified and better match the shall statement.

SuggestedRemedy
 Use this text:
 "Not grant more than one message every 1024 time_quanta to a single ONU"

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 99 **SC** **P 1** **L 2** # 1989
 Brown, Alan Wave7 Optics, Inc.

Comment Type **E** **Comment Status** **D** typo
 Correctly spell "Amendment".

SuggestedRemedy
 Correctly spell "Amendment" in line 2 and line 30.

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 99 **SC** **P 1** **L 2** # 2070
 Kramer, Glen Teknovus, Inc.

Comment Type **E** **Comment Status** **D** typo
 Typo

SuggestedRemedy
 Amendement = Amendment
 Same on line 30

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 99 SC P1 L 29 # 2247
 Ganga, Ilango Intel
 Comment Type E Comment Status D
 It appears that the description here has not been updated since the Task Force review.
 Update the text in this paragraph as appropriate.
 SuggestedRemedy
 As per comment
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 See resolution to comments 1801, 1990

Cl 99 SC P1 L 30 # 1990
 Brown, Alan Wave7 Optics, Inc.
 Comment Type E Comment Status D
 Start of 2nd sentence of paragraph was lost.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add "It " to the 2nd sentence.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 99 SC P1 L 30 # 1801
 Kawatsu, Yasuaki Hitachi Cable Ltd
 Comment Type E Comment Status D
 This draft is a amendment of IEEE ...
 SuggestedRemedy
 I think this part can be corrected as "This draft is an amendment"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 99 SC P1 L 32 # 2101
 Kramer, Glen Teknovus, Inc.
 Comment Type E Comment Status D
 Text still shows D1.802
 SuggestedRemedy
 Update to latest draft version
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 99 SC P2 L 1 # 2246
 Ganga, Ilango Intel
 Comment Type E Comment Status D
 Add abstract of this amendment 802.3av here
 SuggestedRemedy
 As per comment
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 99 SC P2 L 1 # 2416
 DIAB, WAEL BROADCOM
 Comment Type E Comment Status D
 Abstract information is missing.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Please insert
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 99 SC P2 L 4 # 2417
 DIAB, WAEL BROADCOM
 Comment Type E Comment Status D
 Would suggest adding additional keywords
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add 10GEPON
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 99 SC P3 L 10 # 1988
 Brown, Alan Wave7 Optics, Inc.
 Comment Type E Comment Status D typo
 Correctly spell "consecutively".
 SuggestedRemedy
 Correctly spell "consecutively".
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 99 SC P3 L8 # 1992
 Brown, Alan Wave7 Optics, Inc.

Comment Type E Comment Status D typo
 "One exceptions"

SuggestedRemedy
 Correct to "One exception".

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 99 SC 0 P3 L15 # 2248
 Ganga, Ilango Intel

Comment Type E Comment Status D
 On page 3 line 15, Update Amendment name here

Also on page 6 line 20, update the list with WG members at the start of initial WG ballot.

SuggestedRemedy
 As per comment

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 99 SC 99 P10 L1 # 1906
 Dawe, Piers Avago

Comment Type E Comment Status D
 No contents

SuggestedRemedy
 Insert Contents pages after participants and before special symbols

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 99 SC 99 P3 L8 # 1905
 Dawe, Piers Avago

Comment Type E Comment Status D typo
 conciously

SuggestedRemedy
 conciously There are a few other typos: run the spell checker.

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
