

Cl 00 SC 0 P L # 9
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 [Submitted on behalf of Duane Remein]
 Inconsistent use of boolean "false" (sometimes "FALSE")
 SuggestedRemedy
 globally replace (whole word) "false" with "FALSE"
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 00 SC 0 P0 L0 # 12
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 [Submitted on behalf of Duane Remein]
 Revision Tables (Editors' Note cl-2)
 SuggestedRemedy
 Remove Revision Tables from individual clauses and add to frontmatter just after existing
 Editor's Note. Use table from 3av_0905_remein_1.pdf
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 00 SC 0 P98 L15 # 54
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 [Submitted on behalf of Piers Dave]
 In RINxOMA, shouldn't the x be subscript? If it messes up the contents, leave it to staff
 editor.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 01 SC 1.3 P21 L4 # 2
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.
 Comment Type ER Comment Status X
 [Submitted on behalf of Pete Anslow]
 This says "Insert after ITU-T Recommendation G.9752" but G.9752 does not exist in the
 base document.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change "G.9752" to "G.975"
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 01 SC 1.4.95 P21 L42 # 1
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.
 Comment Type ER Comment Status X
 [Submitted on behalf of Pete Anslow]
 The base document text starts "As used in IEEE 802.3 Clause 38 for fiber optic links,".
 Hence, "Clause 38" should be shown in strikethrough font.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change "IEEE 802.3" to "IEEE 802.3 Clause 38" with "Clause 38" shown in strikethrough
 font
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 01 SC 1.5 P22 L11 # 18
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Definition of EOB is plain old strange. END_BURST_DELIMITER without reference to
 proper definition means nothing. Remove it together with brackets.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change definition of EOB to read "EOB<tab>end of burst delimiter"
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 01 SC 1.5 P22 L12 # 19
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.
 Comment Type ER Comment Status X
 EPON = Ethernet Passive Optical Network. Strike "s" at the end of the acronym expansion.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Per comment.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 01 SC 1.5 P22 L13 # 38
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 [Submitted on behalf of Piers Dave]
 OUI can be singular
 SuggestedRemedy
 Identifiers should be Identifier. Not sure about Networks.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 01 SC 1.5 P22 L13 # 20
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.
 Comment Type ER Comment Status X
 OUI = Organizationally Unique Identifier. Strike "s" at the end of the acronym expansion
 SuggestedRemedy
 Per comment.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 01 SC 1.5 P22 L14 # 3
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.
 Comment Type ER Comment Status X
 [Submitted on behalf of Pete Anslow]
 The abbreviation "SCB single copy broadcast" is already in the 802.3 2008 standard
 SuggestedRemedy
 Remove the abbreviation "SCB single copy broadcast" from 1.4 of the .3av draft
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 30 SC 30.3.7.1.5 P27 L18 # 5
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 [Submitted on behalf of Duane Remein]
 Definition of aGoodLLID says "A count of frames received that contain a valid SLD field, as defined in 65.1.3.3.1 or 76.2.6.1.3.1, as appropriate, but passes the CRC-8 check as defined in 65.1.3.3.3 or 76.2.6.1.3.3, as appropriate.;" which is does not match the current standard "A count of frames received that contain a valid SLD field in an OLT, as defined in 65.1.3.3.1, and pass the CRC-8 check, as defined in 65.1.3.3.3.;"
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change to "A count of frames received that contain a valid SLD field in an OLT, as defined in 65.1.3.3.1 or 76.2.6.1.3.1, as appropriate, and pass the CRC-8 check, as defined in 65.1.3.3.3.;" underline the phrase " or 76.2.6.1.3.1, as appropriate" to indicate changed text.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 30 SC 30.3.7.1.5 P27 L19 # 39
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 [Submitted on behalf of Piers Dave]
 In the following: A count of frames received that contain a valid SLD field, as defined in 65.1.3.3.1 or 76.2.6.1.3.1, as appropriate, but passes the CRC-8 check as defined in....
 SuggestedRemedy
 Should that be _and_ passes?
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 30 SC 30.3.7.1.5 P27 L19 # 14
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type TR Comment Status X
 Badly implemented comment #63. The text says "but passes the CRC--8" while it should say "and passes the CRC--8". See 3av_0903_comments_d3_0_accepted.pdf from March meeting in Vancouver

SuggestedRemedy
 Fix it accordingly

Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 30 SC 30.3.7.1.7 P27 L38 # 29
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type E Comment Status X
 [Submitted on behalf of Seiji Kozaki]
 Typo

SuggestedRemedy
 Change "65.1.3.3.2 pr 76.2.6.1.3.2" to "65.1.3.3.2 or 76.2.6.1.3.2"

Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 30 SC 30.5.1.1.2 P28 L34 # 102
 Kimura, Mitsunobu Hitachi Communicatio

Comment Type G Comment Status X
 In the text, words "D1", "D2", "D3", "U1", "U2", "U3" are attached to their next words without space.

SuggestedRemedy
 Add a space after the words.

Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 45 SC 45.2.1 P37 L45 # 41
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type T Comment Status X
 [Submitted on behalf of Piers Dave]
 P2MP ability register should be 10G-EPON abilities register to match 45.2.1.11

SuggestedRemedy
 Also should the reference be regular coloured not green?

Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 45 SC 45.2.1.10 P40 L4 # 42
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type E Comment Status X
 [Submitted on behalf of Piers Dave]
 Registers in 45 have minimal capitals.

SuggestedRemedy
 This should be "PMA/PMD extended ability register" (as it is twice in the base document just above) - bug in base document

Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 45 SC 45.2.1.11 P40 L45 # 43
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type E Comment Status X
 [Submitted on behalf of Piers Dave]
 10G-EPON PMA/PMD Abilities Register should be 10G-EPON PMA/PMD abilities register (several occurrences)

SuggestedRemedy
 Per comment

Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 45 SC 45.2.1.6.1 P39 L40 # 4
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.
 Comment Type ER Comment Status X
 [Submitted on behalf of Pete Anslow]
 Clause 45.2.1.6.1 has the number in the clause title twice
 SuggestedRemedy
 Delete one occurrence of 45.2.1.6.1
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 45 SC 45.2.1.6.1 P39 L40 # 15
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Two times "45.2.1.6.1"
 SuggestedRemedy
 Remove one of them
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 45 SC 45.2.3.29 P43 L42 # 44
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 [Submitted on behalf of Piers Dave]
 Was eliminating the FEC error indication ability bit a good idea? I see you want to make the FEC sync bit marking a mandatory feature. But isn't it usual to have an ability bit for a feature that has a control bit?
 SuggestedRemedy
 Consider reinstating the FEC error indication ability bit but always set to one, like the 10 Gb/s FEC ability bit.
 I would have expected to see:
 In the table: This bit indicates that the 10 Gb/s FEC decoder component of the PCS is able to indicate decoding errors to higher layers (mandatory for 10/1GBASE-PRX or 10GBASE-PR). In a 10/1GBASE-PRX OLT, this bit is undefined. and in 45.2.3.29.1 This bit indicates that the 10 Gb/s FEC decoder component of the 10GBASE-PR or 10/1GBASE-PRX PCS is able to indicate decoding errors to the higher layers (see 76.3.3.3). The bit always reads as one for 10/1GBASE-PRX or 10GBASE-PR. FEC error indication is controlled by a bit in the 10GBASE-PR and 10/1GBASE-PRX FEC control register (see 45.2.3.30.1).
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 45 SC 45.2.3.30 P44 L10 # 50
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 [Submitted on behalf of Piers Dave]Writes should be writes
 SuggestedRemedy
 Per comment
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 45 SC 45.2.3.30 P44 L12 # 40
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 [Submitted on behalf of Piers Dave]
 "enable FEC error indication" should be
 SuggestedRemedy
 Enable FEC error indication
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 45 SC 45.2.3.30 P44 L18 # 45
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 [Submitted on behalf of Piers Dave]
 RO Read only, R/W Read Write should be RO = Read only, R/W = Read/Write
 SuggestedRemedy
 Insert the equals signs
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 45 SC 45.2.3.31 P44 L43 # 103
 Kimura, Mitsunobu Hitachi Communicatio

Comment Type G Comment Status X
 Index text of 45.2.3.31 shows 10GBASE-PR first and 10/1GBASE-PRX second. But main text shows 10/1GBASE-PRX first and 10GBASE -PR second.

SuggestedRemedy
 Match the order of "10GBASE-PR" and "10/1GBASE-PRX" between index and body.

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 45 SC 45.2.3.32 P45 L16 # 104
 Kimura, Mitsunobu Hitachi Communicatio

Comment Type G Comment Status X
 Index of 45.2.3.32 shows "10GBASE-PR FEC and 10/1GBASE-PRX uncorrected FEC codewords", but body text shows "10/1GBASE-PRX and 10GBASE-PR FEC uncorrected codewords".

SuggestedRemedy
 Change the index to "10/1GBASE-PRX and 10GBASE-PR FEC uncorrected codewords".

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 45 SC 45.2.3.33 P45 L35 # 46
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type E Comment Status X
 [Submitted on behalf of Piers Dave]
 "BER Monitor Control register" should be "BER Monitor control register" (3 times)

SuggestedRemedy
 Per comment

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 45 SC 45.2.3.33 P45 L38 # 49
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type T Comment Status X
 [Submitted on behalf of Piers Dave]
 Registers are always there, whether the features are supported or not. Placement of only.

SuggestedRemedy
 Change "This register is only required when 10GBASE-PR or 10/1GBASE-PRX ONU capability is supported" to "This register is defined only if 10GBASE-PR or 10/1GBASE-PRX ONU capability is supported.." Similarly in 45.2.3.34

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 45 SC 45.2.3.33 P45 L48 # 47
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type E Comment Status X
 [Submitted on behalf of Piers Dave]
 Too much text in the table

SuggestedRemedy
 The explanation "A value of 0 indicates that the BER monitor function is disabled." and the default values should be given in the text at line 40, not in the table.

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 45 SC 45.2.3.33 P45 L51 # 48
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type E Comment Status X
 [Submitted on behalf of Piers Dave]
 microseconds should be us (with Greek omicron)

SuggestedRemedy
 twice

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 45 SC 45.2.3.34 P46 L4 # 51
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type E Comment Status X

[Submitted on behalf of Piers Dave]

Table 45-111's title has "bit definitions" while Table 45-112 doesn't. Capitals. Missing a "Monitor".

SuggestedRemedy

Change to:

45.2.3.34 10GBASE-PR and 10/1GBASE-PRX BER Monitor status register (Register 3.81)
The assignments of bits in the 10GBASE-PR and 10/1GBASE-PRX BER Monitor status register is shown in Table 45-112. Table 45-112-10GBASE-PR and 10/1GBASE-PRX BER Monitor status register bit definitions

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 66 SC 66.4.2.1 P59 L13 # 21
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type TR Comment Status X

I am confused with the use of "false" (37 references) and "FALSE" (29 references). Seems like it is not consistent within the clauses we modify / add. Pick one version and use it consistently in all clauses. The same is true for "true" and "TRUE". If there is any technical difference between lower caps and upper caps version of these words, state it. Otherwise align.

SuggestedRemedy

Per comment.

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 66 SC 66.5.3 P60 L12 # 52
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type E Comment Status X

[Submitted on behalf of Piers Dave]

66.5.3 Put a space between [and] several times

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 75 SC 75.10.4.13 P97 L43 # 58
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type E Comment Status X

[Submitted on behalf of Piers Dave]

Don't need "measurements": the "shall" is in "The TDP limit shall be met." It's optional for OM2 Wavelength and spectral width; would save space to remove.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete "measurements" in OM8, consider same for OM2

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 75 SC 75.10.4.15 P98 L45 # 59
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type E Comment Status X

[Submitted on behalf of Piers Dave]

Operating temperature range labeling is mandatory

SuggestedRemedy

Delete "N/A[]"

Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 75 SC 75.4.1 P74 L34 # 13
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type E Comment Status X

In Table 75-5, Table 75--6, there is extra "and" between names of individual PMDs associated with the given columns; in Table 75--11 there is no such surrious "and" even though more than 1 PMD is associated with the particular columns; decide either way but make is consistent in Clause 75

SuggestedRemedy

Suggest to remove "and" from Table 75-5 and 75-6 (will not mark the whole table as changed)

Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 75 SC 75.5.1 P77 L37 # 53
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 [Submitted on behalf of Piers Dave]
 Paragraph split over two pages
 SuggestedRemedy
 Set Table 75-9 to float
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 75 SC 75.7.14 P86 L6 # 56
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 [Submitted on behalf of Piers Dave]
 Why is there a section for receiver 3 dB electrical upper cutoff frequency when there is no spec or even recommendation for it?
 SuggestedRemedy
 Either add specs or recommendations, or delete 75.7.14, row of Table 75-13 and PICS OM12
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 75 SC 75.7.9 P84 L42 # 55
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 [Submitted on behalf of Piers Dave]
 Don't use * for multiply. More technically, "bitRate" is not defined, and the filter used for 10G is not 0.75 * signalling rate, but 7.5 GHz. Do you think you can hold the 10G filter to STM-16 (2.5Bd) tolerances? Clause 52 couldn't.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change:
 Bessel-Thomson receiver response with $fr = 0.75 * \text{bitRate}$, and where the relative response vs. relative frequency is defined in ITU-T G.957, Table B.2 (STM-16 values), along with the allowed tolerances for its physical implementation.
 to
 Bessel-Thomson receiver response as defined in 60.7.8 for 1 Gb/s PMD transmitters and 52.9.7 for 10 Gb/s PMD transmitters.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 75 SC 75.9.3 P89 L35 # 57
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 [Submitted on behalf of Piers Dave]
 Layout of table notes
 SuggestedRemedy
 Make Table 75-14 full width for the sake of the footnotes (and one column header).
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 75C SC 75C.1 P105 L32 # 60
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 [Submitted on behalf of Piers Dave]
 Dj Rj Tj should be DJ RJ TJ. They may be 2-sided (early to late) but they aren't p-p. They are terrible metrics for 64B/66B anyway, it's a good thing this annex is informative!
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change "Dj (UI p--p) Rj (UI p--p) Tj (UI p--p)" to DJ (UI) RJ (UI) TJ (UI)
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 75C SC 75C.1 P107 L10 # 61
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 [Submitted on behalf of Piers Dave]
 downstream_baudrate should be downstream_signaling_rate line
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 76 SC 76.1.2 P108 L50 # 62
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 [Submitted on behalf of Piers Dave]
 What mechanism?
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change to "this protocol"?
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 76 SC 76.2.1 P109 L5 # 63
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 [Submitted on behalf of Piers Dave]
 Should "data link layers to interface with a single physical layer" be:
 SuggestedRemedy
 "Data Link Layers to interface with a single Physical Layer" ? See 802.3 editor's style guide.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 76 SC 76.2.1 P109 L6 # 64
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 [Submitted on behalf of Piers Dave]
 "data links which transmit" should be "data links that transmit". Anyway, the link doesn't unambiguously "transmit" and "receive" because it has two ends.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Should be something like "links with one data rate (e.g. 10 Gb/s) in one direction but another (e.g. 1 Gb/s) in the opposite direction"
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 76 SC 76.2.2.4 P113 L50 # 65
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 [Submitted on behalf of Piers Dave]
 What does "binding" mean? Later on the same word is used in a different context "binding of an ONU to an OLT port". There's a mix of "mapping" and "binding" here and in 76.2.6; should use same word for same thing, each time.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change "binding" to "mapping", three times
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 76 SC 76.3.1.1 P117 L52 # 67
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 [Submitted on behalf of Piers Dave]
 "no explicit specification"?
 SuggestedRemedy
 "no further explicit specification"?
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 76 SC 76.3.1.1 P118 L11 # 72
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 [Submitted on behalf of Piers Dave]
 Something masking top of "PCS"; also in line 30
 SuggestedRemedy
 Per comment
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 76 **SC 76.3.1.1** **P118** **L3** # **68**
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type **E** **Comment Status** **X**
 [Submitted on behalf of Piers Dave]
 RECONCILIATION should be Reconciliation, Transmit Function should be Transmit function, Receive Function should be Receive function, Conceptual Diagram of 10/1GBASE-PRX PCS, OLT Side should be Conceptual diagram of 10/1GBASE-PRX PCS, OLT side

SuggestedRemedy
 Per comment

Proposed Response **Response Status** **O**

Cl 76 **SC 76.3.2** **P118** **L48** # **73**
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type **T** **Comment Status** **X**
 [Submitted on behalf of Piers Dave]
 PCS transmit function should be PCS Transmit function; also in line 49

SuggestedRemedy
 Per comment

Proposed Response **Response Status** **O**

Cl 76 **SC 76.3.2** **P119** **L11** # **69**
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type **T** **Comment Status** **X**
 [Submitted on behalf of Piers Dave] IDLE DELETION should be Idle Deletion, and so on

SuggestedRemedy
 Per comment

Proposed Response **Response Status** **O**

Cl 76 **SC 76.3.2.1** **P119** **L40** # **27**
 Mandin, Jeffrey PMC-Sierra

Comment Type **T** **Comment Status** **X**
 Draft 3.2 changed "Idle detection" to "Idle deletion", but did not do so in each place necessary.

SuggestedRemedy
 Change "Idle Detection" to "Idle Deletion" on page 119, line 40.
 Also on page 156, line 28.

Proposed Response **Response Status** **O**

Cl 76 **SC 76.3.2.4** **P124** **L7** # **74**
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type **T** **Comment Status** **X**
 [Submitted on behalf of Piers Dave]
 Document uses a mix of "FEC F/frame" and "FEC block". Need to pick one: KR uses "FEC block" almost exclusively. Make 9 changes.

SuggestedRemedy
 Per comment

Proposed Response **Response Status** **O**

Cl 76 **SC 76.3.2.4.1** **P124** **L27** # **75**
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type **T** **Comment Status** **X**
 [Submitted on behalf of Piers Dave]
 How does $x^8+x^4+x^3+x^2+1$ equal $0x02$? I thought we had established that $0x02$ just means 2, or 00000011 in binary. Needs better explanation (again!)

SuggestedRemedy
 Per comment

Proposed Response **Response Status** **O**

CI 76 SC 76.3.2.5 P128 L16 # 76
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type T Comment Status X
 [Submitted on behalf of Piers Dave]
 "one packet of a maximum length (forty 66-bit blocks)." 320 bytes? The maximum 802.3
 MAC frame is 2000 bytes so the maximum packet is similar: about 250 66-bit blocks. This
 isn't right.

SuggestedRemedy
 Explain / Correct the statement included in D3.2

Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 76 SC 76.3.2.5.1 P128 L10 # 23
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type TR Comment Status X
 Removal of Figure 76-14 was justified at the time, though in the long run, we lose some
 solid piece of explanation on how Data Detector works in graphical terms. I think it is worth
 considering bringing the Figure back but with modifications, as proposed in
 3av_0905_hajduczenia_3.pdf. Changes to the text in 76.3.2.5.1 are also marked in the file.

SuggestedRemedy
 Per comment.

Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 76 SC 76.3.2.5.1 P128 L20 # 22
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type T Comment Status X
 Unknown PCS - 10GBASE-PRU

SuggestedRemedy
 Change to "10GBASE-PR-U"

Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 76 SC 76.3.2.5.1 P128 L38 # 24
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type ER Comment Status X
 In text "(Treceiver_settling) and synchronize its receive clock (TCDR)." - "receiver_settling"
 and "CDR" should be subscripted.

SuggestedRemedy
 Per comment.

Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 76 SC 76.3.2.6 P134 L14 # 25
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type E Comment Status X
 Logical condition between states FEC_IS_ON and TRANSMIT_PARITY in Figure 76-17 is
 broken without any reason. Put it into a single line.

SuggestedRemedy
 Per comment.

Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 76 SC 76.3.3.1 P136 L18 # 77
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type T Comment Status X
 [Submitted on behalf of Piers Dave]
 31*66 blocks? See style guide and editor's web page for proper multiplication sign. Should
 this be "31, 66-bit blocks"? Same in 76.3.3.2.

SuggestedRemedy
 Per comment

Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 76 SC 76.3.3.1 P136 L19 # 8
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 [Submitted on behalf of Duane Remein]
 Wordsmything Similar to comment 163 in D3.0)
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change:
 "When in codeword lock, the state diagram accumulates the appropriate contents of the 31 blocks that constitute a codeword in an input buffer."
 to:
 "While in codeword lock, the synchronizer copies the FEC-protected bits from each data block and the parity bits of the codeword into an input buffer."
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 76 SC 76.3.3.1.1 P136 L52 # 78
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 [Submitted on behalf of Piers Dave]
 Justify or remove [] in inbuffer[] Also 76.3.3.3.1 outbuffer[]
 SuggestedRemedy
 Per comment
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 76 SC 76.3.3.1.3 P138 L1 # 79
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 [Submitted on behalf of Piers Dave]
 Justify or remove () in BlockFromPMA(). Note that () was almost never used before EFM. also on other pages.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Per comment
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 76 SC 76.3.3.2 P140 L1 # 80
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 [Submitted on behalf of Piers Dave]
 Figure 76-19-PCS Receive bit ordering? Explain / clarify the caption
 SuggestedRemedy
 Per comment
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 76 SC 76.3.3.3 P143 L8 # 81
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 [Submitted on behalf of Piers Dave]
 false or FALSE?
 SuggestedRemedy
 Choose one and use consistently in all clauses.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 76 SC 76.3.3.3 P144 L6 # 82
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 [Submitted on behalf of Piers Dave]
 Text says "then each sync header of the received payload blocks in the FEC codeword is set to a value of binary 00. However, the data blocks are nevertheless passed to the descrambler to maintain descrambling synchronization." There are 31, 66-bit blocks in a codeword, right? Per Fig 49-16, it takes 16 bad sync headers to trip out of block lock and start slipping again. Is this really what you want; a single uncorrectable FEC codeword pulls the link down (even if not for very long)?
 SuggestedRemedy
 Per comment
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 76 **SC 76.3.3.3.1** **P144** **L28** # **70**
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.
Comment Type **E** **Comment Status** **X**
 [Submitted on behalf of Piers Dave]
 What TYPE?
SuggestedRemedy
 Change to "TYPE: array"
Proposed Response **Response Status** **O**

Cl 76 **SC 76.3.3.3.3** **P145** **L12** # **7**
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.
Comment Type **T** **Comment Status** **X**
 [Submitted on behalf of Duane Remein]
 BlockToDescrambler should be BlockToDescrambler()
SuggestedRemedy
 replace BlockToDescrambler with BlockToDescrambler()
Proposed Response **Response Status** **O**

Cl 76 **SC 76.3.3.3.4** **P145** **L46** # **105**
 Kimura, Mitsunobu Hitachi Communicatio
Comment Type **G** **Comment Status** **X**
 "10/1GBASE-PRS-U" is shown.
SuggestedRemedy
 Change "10/1GBASE-PRS-U" to "10/1GBASE-PRX-U".
Proposed Response **Response Status** **O**

Cl 76 **SC 76.3.3.3.4** **P145** **L46** # **83**
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.
Comment Type **T** **Comment Status** **X**
 [Submitted on behalf of Piers Dave]
 "10GBASE-PR, 10GBASE-PR-U and 10/1GBASE-PRS-U" Should PRS be PRX? Isn't
 10GBASE-PR-U a subset of 10GBASE-PR so why mention it? Also 76.3.3.7
SuggestedRemedy
 Per comment
Proposed Response **Response Status** **O**

Cl 76 **SC 76.3.3.3.4** **P145** **L47** # **26**
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.
Comment Type **TR** **Comment Status** **X**
 "10/1GBASE-PRS-U" does not exist - "10/1GBASE-PRX-U" does
SuggestedRemedy
 Per comment
Proposed Response **Response Status** **O**

Cl 76 **SC 76.3.3.3.4** **P145** **L51** # **84**
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.
Comment Type **T** **Comment Status** **X**
 [Submitted on behalf of Piers Dave]
 The FEC decoding process function. Delete "function"?
SuggestedRemedy
 Per comment
Proposed Response **Response Status** **O**

Cl 76 **SC 76.3.3.4** **P146** **L 35** # **85**
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type **T** **Comment Status** **X**
 [Submitted on behalf of Piers Dave]
 The following objects apply to 10G-EPON PCS management. Should that be objectives? If you mean objects, there is no mention of "objects" except in Clause 30. Anyway, why is this paragraph under a heading "BER Monitor control"? If you want to talk about the link between Clause 76 and (optional) MDIO, that's usually done near the beginning of each sublayer's (sub)clause.

SuggestedRemedy
 Per comment

Proposed Response **Response Status** **O**

Cl 76 **SC 76.3.3.4.4** **P171** **L 19** # **28**
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type **T** **Comment Status** **X**
 [Submitted on behalf of Seiji Kozaki]
 In Figure 76-22, the moving condition from BER_BAD_SH to BER_TEST_SH is wrong. To understand clearly, please see and compare with Figure 49-13.

SuggestedRemedy
 Change "ber_test_sh * ber_cnt < ber_threshold * interval_timer_done" to "ber_test_sh * ber_cnt < ber_threshold * !interval_timer_done".

Proposed Response **Response Status** **O**

Cl 76 **SC 76.3.3.7** **P149** **L 16** # **106**
 Kimura, Mitsunobu Hitachi Communicatio

Comment Type **G** **Comment Status** **X**
 "10/1GBASE-PRS-U" is shown.

SuggestedRemedy
 Change "10/1GBASE-PRS-U" to "10/1GBASE-PRX-U".

Proposed Response **Response Status** **O**

Cl 76 **SC 76.3.3.7.3** **P150** **L 20** # **6**
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type **T** **Comment Status** **X**
 [Submitted on behalf of Duane Remein]
 T_TYPE defined twice, once in 76.3.2.1.3 "T_TYPE(tx_raw<71:0>)
 This function is defined in 49.2.13.2.3." and again in 76.3.3.7.3. "T_TYPE(rx_raw)
 This function is defined in 49.2.13.2.3."

SuggestedRemedy
 In remove definition in 76.3.3.7.3 and refer back to definition in 76.3.2.1.3.

Proposed Response **Response Status** **O**

Cl 76 **SC 76.99** **P159** **L 4** # **11**
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type **T** **Comment Status** **X**
 [Submitted on behalf of Duane Remein]
 Subclause 76A.2, Table 76A-1 may be mis-interperated. Is it read in rows or in columns?

SuggestedRemedy
 Add a footnote stating the table is to be read left to right, top to bottom.

Proposed Response **Response Status** **O**

Cl 76A **SC 76A** **P158** **L 6** # **86**
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type **E** **Comment Status** **X**
 [Submitted on behalf of Piers Dave]
 76A FEC Frame Encoding example should be FEC block encoding example,

SuggestedRemedy
 Per comment

Proposed Response **Response Status** **O**

CI 76A **SC 76A.2** **P158** **L36** # **87**
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.
Comment Type **E** **Comment Status** **X**
 [Submitted on behalf of Piers Dave]
 76A.2 64B/66B Block Input should be 64B/66B block input
SuggestedRemedy
 Per comment
Proposed Response **Response Status** **O**

CI 76A **SC 76A.2** **P159** **L5** # **16**
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.
Comment Type **T** **Comment Status** **X**
 Table 76A-1 could be more readable if it was presented in two columns only - see
 3av_0905_hajduczenia_1.pdf
SuggestedRemedy
 Per comment.
Proposed Response **Response Status** **O**

CI 76A **SC 76A.8** **P163** **L23** # **17**
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.
Comment Type **T** **Comment Status** **X**
 Table 76A-7 could be more readable if it was presented in two columns only - see
 3av_0905_hajduczenia_2.pdf
SuggestedRemedy
 Per comment.
Proposed Response **Response Status** **O**

CI 77 **SC 77.1.3** **P169** **L41** # **88**
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.
Comment Type **E** **Comment Status** **X**
 [Submitted on behalf of Piers Dave]
 Figure 77-4: White stuff over text? line 41
SuggestedRemedy
 Remove the offending element
Proposed Response **Response Status** **O**

CI 77 **SC 77.2.2.1** **P175** **L31** # **97**
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.
Comment Type **T** **Comment Status** **X**
 [Submitted on behalf of Duane Remein]
 "FEC_CODEWORD_SIZE value appears to be in error."
SuggestedRemedy
 Change from 148 to 223. Change line41 (FEC_PAYLOAD_SIZE) from 216 to 223.
Proposed Response **Response Status** **O**

CI 77 **SC 77.2.2.7** **P181** **L8** # **71**
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.
Comment Type **E** **Comment Status** **X**
 [Submitted on behalf of Piers Dave]
 Unnecessarily small font: 8 is minimum unless you are desperate for space (not here)
SuggestedRemedy
 Change most or all 7 point (or smaller) to 8 point
Proposed Response **Response Status** **O**

Cl 77 **SC 77.2.2.7** **P184** **L1** # 101
Mandin, Jeffrey PMC-Sierra

Comment Type **T** **Comment Status** **X**

Draft 3.2 revises the ONU control multiplexer in a way which uses "magic numbers" and calculates overhead differently than is done in the OLT. Instead, we should ensure that each new burst maintains the current column alignment. The resulting solution is:

- simpler (no magic numbers)
- consistent with the approach in the OLT control mux
- more efficient (maximum of 3 bytes overhead per burst rather than 3 bytes per-FEC block)

SuggestedRemedy
Revise as in 3av_0509_mandin_1.pdf

Proposed Response **Response Status** **O**

Cl 77 **SC 77.3.2.1** **P186** **L5** # 107
Kimura, Mitsunobu Hitachi Communicatio

Comment Type **G** **Comment Status** **X**

In Figure 77-13, font size of index of each state, e.g. ("INIT", "WAIT FOR TRANSMIT", "TRANSMIT READY", "PARSE OPCODE", etc.) is bigger than Figure 77-12 and Figure 77-14.

SuggestedRemedy
Match the font size of index of each state in Figure 77-13 to the ones in Figure 77-12 and 77-14.

Proposed Response **Response Status** **O**

Cl 77 **SC 77.3.3.2** **P191** **L49** # 100
Kramer, Glen Teknovus, Inc.

Comment Type **T** **Comment Status** **X**

[Submitted on behalf of Eric Lynskey]
Text refers to sync pattern of 0x5555 and needs to be updated to reflect current sync pattern.

SuggestedRemedy
. . .ONU sends a synchronization pattern (see 76.3.2.5.2) followed by a burst delimiter . . .

Proposed Response **Response Status** **O**

Cl 77 **SC 77.3.3.6** **P195** **L24** # 99
Kramer, Glen Teknovus, Inc.

Comment Type **E** **Comment Status** **X**

The section contains multiple state diagrams

SuggestedRemedy
Change section title to State Diagrams
Same for 77.3.4.6

Proposed Response **Response Status** **O**

Cl 77 **SC 77.3.5.5** **P208** **L35** # 89
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type **T** **Comment Status** **X**

[Submitted on behalf of Piers Dave]
Is deactivate a word? I don't think so. Maybe inactive? And what is "the status value"? This is the only section in 802.3av that uses either term, so suspect they are both wrong terms.

SuggestedRemedy
Per comment

Proposed Response **Response Status** **O**

CI 77 SC 77.3.5.6 P210 L41 # 98
Kramer, Glen Teknovus, Inc.

Comment Type T Comment Status X

In Figure 77-29, in INCOMING GRANT state, in the condition (length[counter] > laserOnTime + syncTime + laserOffTime + tailGuard)) all variables and constants are expressed in TQ, except the tailGuard. The tailGuard is defined as 38 octets. Also, using such condition in this clause doesn't make sense, because minimum grant should allow for at least one full FEC codeword.

SuggestedRemedy

Using the following condition instead of the specified:
(length[counter] >= laserOnTime + syncTime + laserOffTime + minGrantLength))
Where minGrantLength is defined as
minGrantLength
TYPE: 32 bit unsigned
This constant represents the minimum effective duration of ONU's transmission, which is equal to one FEC codeword (see FEC_CODEWORD_SIZE in 77.2.2.1) expressed in units of time_quanta.
VALUE: 13

Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 77 SC 77.3.6.1 P215 L10 # 90
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type T Comment Status X

[Submitted on behalf of Piers Dave]
Bad filed name "OLT is 1G upstream capable"; should this be "OLT 1G upstream capability"?

SuggestedRemedy

Per comment

Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 77 SC 77.3.6.3 P218 L22 # 66
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type E Comment Status X

[Submitted on behalf of Piers Dave]
8 bit should be 8-bit

SuggestedRemedy

Scrub the document.

Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 77 SC 77.3.6.3 P218 L45 # 92
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type T Comment Status X

[Submitted on behalf of Piers Dave]
"when constructing a complying MPCP protocol implementation." Should apply in use, not just in constructing. We don't want to discuss non-complying implementations. Delete.

SuggestedRemedy

Per comment

Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 77 SC 77.3.6.3 P247 L27 # 91
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type T Comment Status X

[Submitted on behalf of Piers Dave]
d) Discovery Information. This is a 16-bit flag register. Table 77-6 presents the internal structure of the Discovery Information flag field. Table 77-6-REGISTER_REQ MPCPDU Discovery Information Fields should be d) Discovery Information. This is a 16-bit flag register. Table 77-6 presents the structure of the Discovery Information field. Table 77-6-REGISTER_REQ MPCPDU Discovery Information field

SuggestedRemedy

Per comment

Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 77 SC 77.3.6.4 P219 L49 # 93
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 [Submitted on behalf of Piers Dave]
 Split Table 77-7 REGISTER MPCPDU Flags field
 SuggestedRemedy
 Fix it
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 77 SC 77.3.6.4 P220 L10 # 94
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 [Submitted on behalf of Piers Dave]
 Strange term "higher-layer-entity" Use proper term, here and next page.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Per comment
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 77 SC 77.3.6.5 P221 L23 # 95
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.
 Comment Type T Comment Status X
 [Submitted on behalf of Piers Dave]
 In the following: b) Flags. this is an 8-bit flag register that indicates special requirements for the registration. Echoed assigned port. This field holds a 16-bit unsigned value reflecting the LLID of the port assigned following registration, as presented in Table 77-8. Table 77-8-REGISTER_ACK MPCPDU Flags fields
 SuggestedRemedy
 this should be This. Space after registration. Should Echoed assigned port start a new bullet or be deleted as similar to bullet c? Text says Echoed assigned port. This field holds a 16-bit unsigned value reflecting the LLID of the port assigned following registration, as presented in Table 77-8. but Table 77-8-REGISTER_ACK MPCPDU Flags fields says values 0 to 255 (8 bits).
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 77 SC 77.3.6.5 P250 L37 # 96
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 [Submitted on behalf of Piers Dave]
 Table width. Wasted space: set Figure 77-36-REGISTER_ACK MPCPDU to float?
 SuggestedRemedy
 Per comment
 Proposed Response Response Status W

[s/b Pg 222]
 [was Clause 222 Subclause 222, s/b CI 77 SubCl 77.3.6.5, changed required to import into comment database tool]

CI 77 SC 77.4.1 P223 L11 # 10
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 [Submitted on behalf of Duane Remein]
 Table 77-9 still using 1/1 Gb/s, 10/1 Gbps and 10/10 Gbps foro ONT types.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change to 1G-EPO, 1/10G-EPON and 10/10G-EPON.
 Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 99 SC 99 P14 L23 # 37
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.
 Comment Type E Comment Status X
 [Submitted on behalf of Piers Dave]
 Over-aggressive hyphenation
 SuggestedRemedy
 Set hyphenated minimum to 3: Paragraph designer, Advanced, set shortest suffix to 3
 Proposed Response Response Status O

Cl 99 *SC* 99 *P*2 *L*2 # 30
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **X**
 [Submitted on behalf of Piers Dave]
 Missing spaces

SuggestedRemedy
 10Gb/s should be 10 Gb/s 4 times, 1Gb/s should be 1 Gb/s (twice)

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl 99 *SC* 99 *P*3 *L*13 # 31
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **X**
 [Submitted on behalf of Piers Dave]
 IEEE Std 802.3xx-200X

SuggestedRemedy
 Should this be IEEE Std 802.3av-200X ? Also at line 40. If so, TM at p4 line 21 would appear earlier, not there.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl 99 *SC* 99 *P*3 *L*37 # 32
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **X**
 [Submitted on behalf of Piers Dave]
 IEEE Std 802.3-200X

SuggestedRemedy
 Should be IEEE Std 802.3-2008 Also at line 43

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl 99 *SC* 99 *P*3 *L*40 # 33
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **X**
 [Submitted on behalf of Piers Dave]

SuggestedRemedy
 change "is comprises of" to "is composed of" or to "comprises"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl 99 *SC* 99 *P*4 *L*10 # 34
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **X**
 [Submitted on behalf of Piers Dave]
 As in P802.3bc, please change "specify subscriber access physical layers and sublayers" to...

SuggestedRemedy
 specify subscriber access and other physical layers and sublayers

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl 99 *SC* 99 *P*5 *L*39 # 35
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **X**
 [Submitted on behalf of Piers Dave]
 Why is this URL not blue like the others? Also bottom of p33, p158

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

CI 99 SC 99 P6 L18 # 36
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type E Comment Status X

[Submitted on behalf of Piers Dave]
Ordinary members should appear here.

SuggestedRemedy

Using graphics tools, select graphical object (arrow symbol), stretch the bottom of the triple columns and the bottom of the anchored frame so it fits on p6. You will have to move a few names to the continuation frame (and maybe resize it also).

Proposed Response Response Status O