Cl **00** *SC* **0** *P* **0** *L* **0** # i-9

Turner, Michelle

Comment Type **GR** *Comment Status* **D**

This draft meets all editorial requirements.

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **01** *SC* **1.4.26** *P* **15** *L* **7** # i-8

Marris, Arthur Cadence Design Syst

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

Should be "Clause 60, Clause 64 and Clause 65"

SuggestedRemedy

Should be "Clause 60, Clause 64 and Clause 65"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.

The order follows the description for 10G-EPON in Clause 1.4.26 and 1.4.27, such as; "See IEEE Std 802.3, Table 56–1, Clause 75, Clause 76, and Clause 77" as in 1.4.41 of 802.3bk D3.0, which describes PMD, PCS, and MPMC, respectively, where the description goes from the bottom to the top in layer model.

Therefore, for 1G-EPON, the current order of Clause 60, Clause 65, and Clause 64 seems reasonable.

Cl **30** *SC* **30** *P* **00** *L* # i-6

Diab, Wael Broadcom Corporation

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **D**

As discussed and reported on by the Maint TF, please implement MR 1240.

http://www.ieee802.org/3/maint/requests/revision_history.html#REQ1240

SuggestedRemedy

http://www.ieee802.org/3/maint/requests/maint_1240.pdf

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **30** *SC* **30** *P* **17** *L* **1** # i-7

Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corporation

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

*** Comment submitted with the file 77984400003-8023bk_1305_hajduczenia_1.zip attached ***

The approved version of the 802.3-2012 standard includes definitions of aFECUncorrectableBlocks and aFECCorrectedBlocks in Clause 30, which were simultanously modified by P802.3ba and P802.3av projects. During the process of merging all amendments into a single base document, it seems that changes from P802.3ba overwrite changes from P802.3av, effectively making changes from P802.3av to these two objects disappear.
The attached document (8023bk_1305_hajduczenia_01.pdf) provides overview of the changes:
- pages 1, 2 show these two objects in D1.0 of 802.3-2012 revision
- page 3 show changes to these two objects in published 802.3av-2009
- pages 4, 5 show changes to these two objects in published 802.3ba-2010
- pages 6, 7 show these two objects in the published version of 802.3-2012
By comparing the said pages, it is clear that changes outlined on page 3 are missing from the published version of the base standard.

SuggestedRemedy

Implement changes as shown in 8023bk_1305_hajduczenia_02.pdf (modified text is highlighted in yellow).

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

With slight modifications as follows:

For 30.5.1.1.17, in the 3rd paragraph of "BEHAVIOUR DEFINED AS" section,
(see 45.2.8.5 and 45.2.1.91 for 10GBASE-R, 45.2.3.40 for 10GBASE-PR and 10/1GBASE-PRX, and 45.2.1.93 for BASE-R).:

is changed to:

(see 45.2.7.5 and 45.2.1.91 for 10GBASE-R, 45.2.3.39 for 10GBASE-PR and 10/1GBASE-PRX, and 45.2.1.93 for BASE-R).:

For 30.5.1.1.18, in the 3rd paragraph of "BEHAVIOUR DEFINED AS" section,
(see 45.2.8.6 and 45.2.1.92 for 10GBASE-R, 45.2.3.41 for 10GBASE-PR and 10/1GBASE-PRX, and 45.2.1.94 for BASE-R).:

is changed to:

(see 45.2.7.5 and 45.2.1.92 for 10GBASE-R, 45.2.3.40 for 10GBASE-PR and 10/1GBASE-PRX, and 45.2.1.94 for BASE-R).:

Cl **30** *SC* **30.5.1.1.2** *P* **17** *L* **6** # i-1

Hajduczenia, Marek — ZTE Corporation

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

The formatting of aMAUType in published version of 802.3-2012 is incorrect (see book 2, page 437). There seems to be missing tab characters between the value and its description.
The formatting has been corrected in P802.3bk, but the staff editor need to make sure that the formatting in the source document is also fixed. For that end, it is suggested to extend the scope of the editorial note applicable to aMAUType.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the text of the editorial note on page 17, lines 3-4, to read as follows:
"Make sure that formatting in 30.5.1.1.2 is as shown below, i.e., each listed value is followed by at least one tab and then by the value description. Change the list of MAU types in 30.5.1.1.2, inserting new PMD types in the appropriate locations, as follows:"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **49** *SC* **49.2.4.7** *P* **00** *L* # i-5

Diab, Wael — Broadcom Corporation

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **D**

As discussed in and reported on by the Maint TF, please implement IEEE 802.3 Maintenance Request MR 1236:
http://www.ieee802.org/3/maint/requests/revision_history.html#REQ1236

SuggestedRemedy

http://www.ieee802.org/3/maint/requests/maint_1236.pdf

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **60** *SC* **60.10.4.2** *P* **47** *L* **6** # i-2

Anslow, Peter — Ciena Corporation

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **D**

Items PX10D1 through PX10D5 and items PX10U1 through PX10U5 have incorrect subclause references.
Note, the incorrect Table references are the subject of another comment.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the subclause references to
PX10D1 should be 60.3.1
PX10D2 should be 60.3.1
PX10D3 should be 60.3.2
PX10D4 should be 60.3.2
PX10D5 should be 60.3.2
PX10U1 should be 60.3.1
PX10U2 should be 60.3.1
PX10U3 should be 60.3.2
PX10U4 should be 60.3.2
PX10U5 should be 60.3.2
All references should be links.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **60** *SC* **60.3.1** *P* **31** *L* **38** # i-3

Anslow, Peter — Ciena Corporation

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **D**

There are multiple instances of references to "Table 60-8" which should not point to Table 60-8 (and currently have a hyperlink to a different table).

SuggestedRemedy

On page 31, line 38 "Table 60-8" should be "Table 60-3" and the hyperlink incorrectly points to Table 60-8a
On page 31, line 39 "Table 60-8" (in strikethrough font) should be "Table 60-3" and the hyperlink incorrectly points to Table 60-8a
On page 33, line 50 "Table 60-8" (in strikethrough font) should be "Table 60-6" and the hyperlink incorrectly points to Table 60-8a
On Page 47, line 7, item PX10D1 "Table 60-8" should be "Table 60-3" and the hyperlink incorrectly points to Table 60-8a
On Page 47, line 9, item PX10D2 "Table 60-8" should be "Table 60-3" and the hyperlink incorrectly points to Table 60-8a
On Page 47, line 12, item PX10D3 "Table 60-8" should be "Table 60-5" and the hyperlink incorrectly points to Table 60-8c
On Page 47, line 14, item PX10D4" Table 60-8" should be "Table 60-5" and the hyperlink incorrectly points to Table 60-8c
On Page 47, line 18, item PX10D5 "Table 60-8" should be "Table 60-5" and the hyperlink incorrectly points to Table 60-8c
On Page 47, line 27, item PX10U1 "Table 60-8" should be "Table 60-3" and the hyperlink incorrectly points to Table 60-8a
On Page 47, line 29, item PX10U2 "Table 60-8" should be "Table 60-3" and the hyperlink incorrectly points to Table 60-8a
On Page 47, line 32, item PX10U3 "Table 60-8" should be "Table 60-5" and the hyperlink incorrectly points to Table 60-8c
On Page 47, line 34, item PX10U4 "Table 60-8" should be "Table 60-5" and the hyperlink incorrectly points to Table 60-8c
On Page 47, line 38, item PX10U5 "Table 60-8" should be "Table 60-5" and the hyperlink incorrectly points to Table 60-8c

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **60** *SC* **60.4a.1** *P* **36** *L* **8** # i-4

Anslow, Peter — Ciena Corporation

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

In Table 60-8a, the SMSR and RMS spectral width specs are applied to both 1000BASEPX30-D and 1000BASE-PX30-U.

But footnote c is applied only to the SMSR row - it should be applied to the RMS spectral width row too.

Footnote c only discusses the 1000BASE-PX30-U PMD - what about the 1000BASE-PX30-D PMD? as currently written both specs (SMSR and RMS spectral width) apply.

The RMS spectral width for both Tx types refers to Table 60-8b - but the table only defines 1000BASE-PX30-U transmitter spectral limits.

The text below Table 60-8a points to Table 60-8b for 1000BASE-PX30 (therefore both Tx types) but then only points to 1000BASE-PX30-U being shown in Figure 60-4a.

Since Table 60-8a has the RMS spectral width requirement for both Tx types in Table 60-8b, why does Figure 60-4a only show the curve for 1000BASE-PX30-U?

SuggestedRemedy

Either change the requirements for SMSR and RMS spectral width in Table 60-8a to be different from that currently shown, or:

Apply note c to "RMS spectral width (max)" as well as SMSR.
Change note c from:
"If 1000BASE-PX30-U PMD employs a DFB laser, ..." to:
"If the transmitter employs a DFB laser, ..."
Change the titles of Table 60-8b and Figure 60-4a to:
"1000BASE-PX30-D and 1000BASE-PX30-U transmitter spectral limits"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Note c is applied to "RMS spectral width (max)" as well as SMSR.
The titles of Table 60-8b and Figure 60-4a are changed to:
"1000BASE-PX30-D and 1000BASE-PX30-U transmitter spectral limits"
Column for RMS spectral width (max) is devided into two and "N/A" is filled in for 1000BASE-PX30-D PMD.

Some text is added as in "8023bk_1305_nishihara_02.pdf" to clarify that 1000BASE-PX30-D transmitter uses DFB laser only and 1000BASE-PX-30-U transmitter can use either DFB or Fabry-Perot laser.

Cl **60** *SC* **60.4b.2** *P* **40** *L* **1** # i-12

Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corporation

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

*** Comment submitted with the file 78047100003-8023bk_1305_nishihara_1.pdf attached ***

This comment was submitted on behalf of Susumu Nishihara.
In Table 60-8e, PX40 receiver specifications were implemented incorrectly, i.e., Average receive power (max) and Damage threshold (max)a for ONU and OLT are reversed - this results from an incorrect implementation of comment #5 on D2.0 as approved (http://www.ieee802.org/3/bk/comments/8023bk_D20_resolved.pdf).

SuggestedRemedy

Implement the change in Table 60-8a per 8023bk_1305_nishihara_1.pdf.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **75** *SC* **75.4** *P* **59** *L* **6** # i-11

Marris, Arthur Cadence Design Syst

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

In Table 75-5 shouldn't 10GBASE-PR-D3 have a higher launch power than 10GBASE-PR-D2?

SuggestedRemedy

In the description heading of Table 75-5 swap 10GBASE-PR-D2 and 10GBASE-PR-D3. Also swap 10GBASE-PRX-D2 and 10GBASE-PRX-D3

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.

OLT transmitter for PR20 or PRX20 PMD uses higher-power LD than the one for PR30 or PRX30 to achieve loss budget of 24 dB while reusing the PR10 or PRX10 receiver at the ONU side. PR40-D or PRX40-D also reuses the PR20-D or PRX20-D device.

Cl **76** *SC* **76.2.6.1.3.2** *P* **0** *L* **0** # i-10

Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corporation

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

Comment text: comment #235 against 802.3bh D2.0 (http://www.ieee802.org/3/bh/comments/P802d3_802d3_bh_D2p0_All_Clause.pdf) was implemented incorrectly, in that the approved addition of item f) was implemented in Clause 65, effectively adding support for multicast LLIDs for 1G-EPON, while the similar change was not implemented in Clause 76, subclause 76.2.6.1.3.2, effectively leaving 10G-EPON without support for multicast LLIDs.

SuggestedRemedy

Add Clause 76 to the draft. Add item "f) If the received logical_link_id value matches one of the assigned multicast LLIDs, then the comparison is considered a match." in 76.2.6.1.3.2, immediately after item e), with the necessary and appropriate editorial note to this effect.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **76** *SC* **76.3.2.2** *P* **617** *L* **0** # i-13

Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corporation

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

76.3.2.2 64B/66B Encode makes reference to Figure 49-14, which represents the "Lock state diagram". it is likely that the proper reference is Figure 49-16, representing "Transmit state diagram".
Similarly, in 76.3.3.6 66B/64B Decode, reference to Figure 49-15 should be actually Figure 49-17.

SuggestedRemedy

Add 76.3.2.2 and 76.3.3.6 and then implement changes per comment.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.