

CI 00 SC 0 P L # 3859  
Anslow, Pete Ciena

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

IEEE uses an en-dash for a minus sign. The draft contains many instances of a hyphen being used instead.

SuggestedRemedy

Where a hyphen is used as a minus sign, replace with an en-dash. The editor has been sent a marked up copy of the draft showing 83 instances that should be replaced.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 00 SC 0 P 1 L 1 # 3942  
Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

Check the characters that can precede a line break in each clause: Choose Format > Document > Text Options Remove "/" and en-dash if present.

SuggestedRemedy

per comment

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 00 SC 0 P 13 L 0 # 4158  
Dawe, Piers Mellanox

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

Some headers say "IEEE Std 802.3-2012" while others say "IEEE Std 802.3-201x"

SuggestedRemedy

Fix

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Change all to IEEE Std 802.3-2015

CI 00 SC 0 P 13 L 1 # 3976  
Booth, Brad Microsoft

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

Table of Contents per the IEEE-SA style guide is only required to show up to heading #3.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to only show 3 levels of headers.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 00 SC 0 P 37 L 36 # 3947  
Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

Much of this register is status; this should be reflected in it's name

SuggestedRemedy

Change in 9 places: "10GPASS-XR control" to "10GPASS-XR control and status"

Table 45-3 1x  
CI 45.2.1.131 3x  
Table 101-1 2x  
Table 102-3 3x

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 00 SC 0 P 55 L 45 # 3861  
 Anslow, Pete Ciena

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

There are still many instances of text that should be cross-references.  
 Since they are text, they should be checked for accuracy before being made cross-references.

#### SuggestedRemedy

Change the following text to cross-references:

Page 55, line 45 "102.2.6.2"  
 Page 59, line 14 "102.2.3"  
 Page 109, line 22 "100.2.9.1"  
 Page 122, line 1 "Clause 100"  
 Page 148, line 9 "Table 101-4"  
 Page 153, line 27 "Figure 100-3"  
 Page 153, line 27 "100.2.9.7"  
 Page 173, line 12 "Table 100-2"  
 Page 173, line 42 "101.4.2.5.1"  
 Page 180, line 36 "101.4.3.6.4"  
 Page 180, line 37 "101.4.3.6.x" (with correct reference)  
 Page 180, line 40 "101.4.2.1"  
 Page 186, line 24 "Figure 4" (with correct reference)  
 Page 196, line 46 "Table 100-1"  
 Page 197, line 14 "Table 100-1"  
 Page 206, line 15 "Figure 101.x.x.x" (with correct reference)  
 Page 212, line 17 "101.x.x.x" (with correct reference)  
 Page 212, line 18 "101.4.3.8.1"  
 Page 231, line 47 "Figure 101-15"  
 Page 243, line 6 "Clause 45" (should not be forest green)  
 Page 243, line 13 "Cl 45" (Should be "Clause 45")  
 Page 284, line 49 "102.4.1.6"  
 Page 296, line 30 "Table 103-1"  
 Page 304, line 21 "Table 101-2"  
 Page 334, line 2 "Annex 31B"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 However Page 148, line 9 should be "Table 101-2"

CI 00 SC 0 P 83 L 16 # 3945  
 Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

Title and Headings in Table 100-1 (and 101-1 and 102-3) could be more accurate.

#### SuggestedRemedy

Change the title to each table to "MDIO register to PHY variable mapping"  
 Change PMA/PMD register name" to "MDIO register name"  
 Change PMA/PMD variable" to "PHY variable"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 00 SC 100.2 P 85 L 43 # 3721  
 Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks

Comment Type ER Comment Status D EZ

"10GPASS-XR" with em-dash or "10GPASS-XR" with normal hyphen.

#### SuggestedRemedy

Looking at recent projects and the way the PMD/PHY names are spelled out, normal hyphen seems to be used.  
 Please change all instances of "10GPASS-XR" with em-dash to "10GPASS-XR" with normal hyphen

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Peter says "It is a dash (not an en dash or an em dash)." Further make sure non-breaking (Esc - h). Verify/change throughout document to verify dash.

Changed to Clause 00.

CI 00 SC 101.6.2.2 P 227 L 22 # 3872  
 Anslow, Pete Ciena

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

The PICS\_year variable in Clauses 101, 102 and 103 is set to "2012", but it should be "201x"

#### SuggestedRemedy

Change the PICS\_year variable in Clauses 101, 102 and 103 from "2012" to "201x"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
 Check all clauses

CI 00 SC 45.2.7a.1 P 58 L 29 # 3694  
 Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

Double "." at the end of line: "The assignment of bits in the DS OFDM channel ID register is shown in Table 45-211b. ."

SuggestedRemedy  
 Replace ". ." with "."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
 Changed to CI 00  
 Do global search.

CI 00 SC 45.2.7a.5 P 61 L 42 # 3632  
 Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

Double space at the end of the sentence in line 42

SuggestedRemedy  
 Chane ". ." to "."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Changed to CI 00  
 Also found at pg/ln in  
 CI 45 58/28,  
 CI 100 94/33, and  
 CI 102 147/2

CI 01 SC 1.4 P 26 L 20 # 3897  
 Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

It appears to be common practice to include the mnemonic in parenthesis after the term so for example  
 1.4.144a coax cable distribution network: would be  
 1.4.144a coax cable distribution network (CCDN):

SuggestedRemedy  
 Add mnemonics to the following as shown  
 1.4.144a coax cable distribution network (CCDN):  
 1.4.145b coax line terminal (CLT):  
 1.4.146c coax network unit (CNU):  
 1.4.170a cyclic prefix (CP):

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 01 SC 1.4.144a P 26 L 20 # 3977  
 Booth, Brad Microsoft

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

Definition does not follow typical format.

Also applies to 1.4.144b and c.

SuggestedRemedy  
 Change to read:  
 1.4.144a coax cable distribution network (CCDN):...  
 1.4.144b coax line terminal (CLT):...  
 1.4.144c coax network unit (CNU):...

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 01 SC 1.4.144a P 26 L 21 # 4173  
 Law, David HP

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

Based on the use of the text '... carrying RF signals ...' suggest that RF be added to subclause 1.5.

SuggestedRemedy  
 Add 'RF radio frequency', in alphabetical order, to the changes to subclause 1.5 on page 27.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 01 SC 1.4.145b P 26 L 23 # 4174  
Law, David HP

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

The three new definitions being inserted consecutively after existing subclause 1.4.144 should be numbered 1.4.144a, 1.4.144b and 1.4.144c.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Subclause '1.4.145b' should be numbered '1.4.144b' and subclause '1.4.146c' should be numbered '1.4.144c'.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 01 SC 1.4.170a P 26 L 32 # 3639  
Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks

Comment Type T Comment Status D EZ

"samples of the same symbol" - likely, "the same OFDM symbol" to be precise - the term "symbol" is ambiguous

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change "samples of the same symbol" to "samples of the same OFDM symbol"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

The clarifying "OFDM" is clear from the context:

"1.4.170a cyclic prefix: A redundant set of samples prepended to an OFDM symbol"

Note that there are 3 uses of the term symbols in the sentence; one with OFDM and two without.

Cl 01 SC 1.4.294a P 26 L 47 # 3640  
Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks

Comment Type T Comment Status D EZ

"A data transmission channel in which the transmitted data is carried over a large number of orthogonal QAM subcarriers." - whether the number is large or small is irrelevant to a definition

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change to "A data transmission channel in which the transmitted data is carried over a number of orthogonal QAM subcarriers."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 01 SC 1.5 P 27 L 25 # 3973  
Victor Hou Broadcom Corporation

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

Definition of abbreviation HFC is not correct.

*SuggestedRemedy*

The definition should be "Hybrid Fiber Coax", not "Hybrid Fiber Coax Network."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 100 SC P 107 L 11 # 3952  
Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

In all the following formulas "used in the following formula"? Even in those of other clauses to be defined in some far distant future?

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change to specific reference such as "use in Equation 100-19 and Equation 100-20"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 100 SC 1.1 P 77 L 16 # 4005  
Effenberger, Frank Huawei

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

The phrase "Trunk and branch" is used here; however, in clause 67.2.3, the term "Tree and branch" term is used. I believe that "tree and branch" is actually the widely used term, even though it is not so correct

*SuggestedRemedy*

Make the terms uniform, one way or another.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 100 SC 1.1 P 78 L 16 # 4007  
 Effenberger, Frank Huawei

Comment Type T Comment Status D EZ

The composition of the CCDN is explained to be cables, taps/couplers, and (optionally) amplifiers. Might it also be mentioned that optical analogs are also possible?

*SuggestedRemedy*

Add the following phrase after amplifier, "and/or analog optical links"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 100 SC 1.5 P 83 L 16 # 3989  
 Amason, Dale Freescale

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

Unecessary comma "Mapping of PCS, and PMA variables"

*SuggestedRemedy*

Remove comma

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 100 SC 100.1 P 77 L 11 # 3706  
 Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

"in downstream direction and up to 1.6 Gb/s in upstream direction" - missing "the" before "downstream" and "upstream"

*SuggestedRemedy*

For consistency, it seems that it is "the downstream direction" and "the upstream direction" everywhere else

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 100 SC 100.1.1 P 77 L 25 # 3707  
 Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

Either I have problems with eyes or symbols for floor and ceil functions are of different size.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Please make sure both symbols are the same (have the same height)

Also, make sure that sentences for ceil and floor functions are together in the same para - there is no need to separate them into new paras

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Will review FM and see if same font size. If they are the same, will adjust for editor's eyeball.

CI 100 SC 100.1.3 P 78 L 16 # 4073  
 Dwelley, David Linear Technology

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

Missing ")" after "PMA (Clause 101)" label

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change to: "PMA (Clause 101)"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 100 SC 100.1.3 P 78 L 44 # 4038  
 Trowbridge, Steve Alcatel-Lucent

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

A few of the boxes in the figure are misaligned. For example, the box around "coax" at line 44 is a few pixels to the left of the MDI box above it.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Zoom in close and nudge the figure elements so that they line up.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

We do nudge these up and Framemaker cheerfully misaligns at its whim. We will go back and re-nudge to see if it behaves this time.

Cl 100 SC 100.1.3 P 79 L 29 # 4039  
Trowbridge, Steve Alcatel-Lucent

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

Several misalignments in this figure: the pilot insertion boxes are all a few pixels to the left of the IFFT boxes below. The pilot insertion 1 and 5 boxes don't align with the edges of the symbol mapper box above. The error to the right of the Subcarrier Configuration and bit loading box doesn't go all the way to the box. The boxes around "SCRAMBLER" and "FCP GENERATION" are slightly different heights

*SuggestedRemedy*

Zoom in close and tidy up the figure by nudging the elements to line up

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

We do nudge these up and Framemaker cheerfully misaligns at its whim. We will go back and re-nudge to see if it behaves this time.

Cl 100 SC 100.1.3 P 79 L 47 # 3732  
Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks

Comment Type T Comment Status D EZ

Caption of Figure 100-2 is incorrect: there are no "transmit PCS, PMA, and PMD sublayers" - there are "PCS, PMA, and PMD sublayers, transmit direction"

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change caption for Figure 100-2 to read: "Functional blocks within 10GPASS-XR-D CLT PCS, PMA, and PMD sublayers, transmit direction".

Similar changes to caption of Figure 100-3, Figure 100-4, and Figure 100-5

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 100 SC 100.1.3 P 80 L 34 # 4040  
Trowbridge, Steve Alcatel-Lucent

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

Several misalignments in Figure 100-3. There is a gap between the Pre-equalization and IDFT box and the box below. The arrow below the Staging and Pilot Insertion doesn't go all the way to the box. Several of the corners in the arrow lines either don't join or extend past the intersection point when they go around a 90 degree bend.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Zoom in close and tidy up the figure by nudging the elements so they line up.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

We do nudge these up and Framemaker cheerfully misaligns at its whim. We will go back and re-nudge to see if it behaves this time.

Cl 100 SC 100.1.3 P 81 L 30 # 4041  
Trowbridge, Steve Alcatel-Lucent

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

Similar alignment issues to previous figures: the De-interleaving 1-5 boxes don't line up with the FFT boxes below, and De-interleaving 1 and 5 boxes don't line up with the symbol mapper box above. The arrow to the right of the Subcarrier configuration and bit loading box doesn't go all the way to the box.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Zoom in close and tidy up the figure by nudging the elements to line up

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

We do nudge these up and Framemaker cheerfully misaligns at its whim. We will go back and re-nudge to see if it behaves this time.

CI 100 SC 100.1.3 P 82 L 15 # 4042  
Trowbridge, Steve Alcatel-Lucent

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

Similar alignment problems as with previous figures. There is a gap between the 64B/66B decoder box and the FEC decoder box below. The arrow from the Pilot and Marker Pattern box doesn't touch the box. The tiny gap between the OFDM Frame Configuration and Bit Loading box and the Frame Timing box below should be made larger if it was intentional or eliminated if not.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Zoom in close and tidy up the figure by nudging the elements to line up.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

We do nudge these up and Framemaker cheerfully misaligns at its whim. We will go back and re-nudge to see if it behaves this time.

CI 100 SC 100.1.4 P 83 L 10 # 3745  
Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks

Comment Type TR Comment Status D EZ

"The data rate of a 10GPASS-XR PHY is dependent on network configuration (see Table 56-1)." - yet Table 56-1 lists only maximum values (up to) and says nothing about conditions you're referencing here, or what the relationship between said network conditions and effective data rate is.

*SuggestedRemedy*

It seems that reference to 100.2.6.1 and 100.2.6.2 for downstream and upstream directions, respectively, would be much better here, since at least you explain there how data rate is calculated.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Line 9. Change: "is defined in this clause" to "is defined in clause, with DS data rate calculation in 100.2.6.1"

Line 13: Change "is defined in this clause" to "is defined in this clause, with US data rate calculation in 100.2.6.2"

Coordinate changes with Comment #3708

CI 100 SC 100.1.4 P 83 L 9 # 3708  
Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

It is odd that the 10GPASS-XR-D type PMD is separated from sentence on 10GPASS-XR-U type PMD that happens to be in a separate para.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Merge sentence in line 9 with sentence in line 13 into a single para. Sentence in line 10 to be added to the end of this new para.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 100 SC 100.1.5 P 83 L 16 # 4027  
Ran, Adee Intel

Comment Type T Comment Status D EZ

"Mapping of PCS, and PMA variables" does not seem to belong in the PMD clause. Is it really the PCS/PMA? line 20 and table headings refer to PMD, so I'm confused.

*SuggestedRemedy*

If this is then an error in the title, correct the title.

If the title is correct, then this subclause should be part of clause 101.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Title was change in Comment #3944 which addresses this comment.

CI 100 SC 100.1.5 P 83 L 16 # 3944  
Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

This title seems a bit odd for a PMD clause and does not match the para text.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change from  
"Mapping of PCS, and PMA variables"  
to  
"Mapping of PMD variables"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 100 SC 100.2 P 85 L 44 # 3710  
 Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ  
 "PMD functions are implementation dependent " - here, "implementation dependent" is an adjective and should have a hyphen  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change all instances of "implementation dependent" to "implementation-dependent"  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 100 SC 100.2.1 P 85 L 50 # 4022  
 Ran, Adeel Intel  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ  
 There is one service interface, with multiple primitives.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change "These PMD sublayer service interfaces are" to "The service interface is".  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 100 SC 100.2.1.3 P 86 L 37 # 3711  
 Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ  
 "Both I\_value and Q\_value are encoded as 32-bit signed integers" - in other locations, names of parameters are italicized  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Italicize the names of parameters I\_value and Q\_value in 100.2.1.2 and in 100.2.1.2 - compare the use of italics in 100.2.1.4  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 100 SC 100.2.12.2.1 P 113 L 53 # 3911  
 Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D EZ  
 We do not have "multiple modulation profile configuration"  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Strike "multiple"  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 100 SC 100.2.12.2.1 P 113 L 54 # 3954  
 Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ  
 Which spec? There are many many specs of dust to choose from!  
 Same issues pg 114 line 9-10  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change "spec" to "standard"  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 100 SC 100.2.2 P 87 L 14 # 3736  
 Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D EZ  
 Unnecessary repetition: "Tx\_Enable takes the values of ON and OFF. When there is no RF signal being sent (OFF) the transmitter is in the OFF state." - it is already covered in the definition of PMD\_SIGNAL.request primitive  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Remove tthe selected text  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.



Cl 100 SC 100.2.6.1 P 90 L 43 # 4079  
 Rahman, Saifur Comcast Cable

Comment Type T Comment Status D EZ

Formula for extended symbol duration does not include the rolloff time.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Verify definition of extended symbol does not include roll off time

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

From RF folks: we have verified that the roll off time is not included and intended not be included.

Cl 100 SC 100.2.7.1 P 90 L 26 # 3902  
 Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies

Comment Type T Comment Status D EZ

MR in PICS states "" however in 100.2.7.1 & 100.2.7.2 there individual requirements for each direction.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Add below 100.2.7

"Equipment conforming to this standard shall clearly mark supported downstream and upstream frequency ranges."

Remove the last sentence in para's 100.2.7.1 & 100.2.7.2 that both begin "Equipment conforming to this standard shall clearly mark supported ..."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 100 SC 100.2.7.3 P 90 L 42 # 3986  
 Szczepanek, Andre Inphi

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

"OFDM channel n"  
 would be better worded as  
 "OFDM downstream channel n"  
 and would be consistent with the text for US\_Freq

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change to  
 "OFDM downstream channel n"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

To parallel US\_FreqCh1, change "the OFDM channel n" to "downstream OFDM channel n".

Subclause did not include 100; added by editor

Cl 100 SC 100.2.9.4 P 100 L 28 # 3957  
 Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies

Comment Type ER Comment Status D EZ

"The CNU updates its reported power per channel in each channel by the following steps" but the CNU only has one OFDMA channel.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change to:  
 "The CNU updates its reported power by the following steps"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 100 SC 100.2.9.5.1 P 101 L 11 # 3905  
 Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies

Comment Type T Comment Status D EZ

Eq 100-11 does not define NS\_Max as implied by the statement "Let NS\_-  
 Max be the number of modulated subcarriers in an OFDMA symbol as per Equation (100-11):"

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change para to read:

"The parameter SpurFloor is related to the ratio of the number of subcarriers being modulated  
 by a CNU in an OFDMA symbol to the maximum number of subcarriers available (3840)  
 including guardbands and is calculated per Equation (100-11):

{\*\*\* Equation 101-11 as per draft \*\*\*}

Where:

NS\_Max is the number of modulated subcarriers in an OFDMA symbol"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 100 SC 100.2.9.5.2 P 103 L 24 # 3950  
 Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

"Spur Floor" should be "SpurFloor" (and in italics)

*SuggestedRemedy*

per comment

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 100 SC 100.2.9.5.2 P 103 L 3 # 3959  
 Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies

Comment Type ER Comment Status D EZ

This statement strikes me as odd "Table 100-8 lists the required spurious level in a  
 measurement interval." I would expect that if I can by some miracle be able to make a  
 transmitter without any spurious levels I am not allowed to do so. :-)

A similar issues exists at SCL 100.2.9.5.3 pg 104 line 41 "Table 100-8 lists the required  
 adjacent channel spurious emission levels when there ..."

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change the statement to read:

"Table 100-8 lists the allowed spurious emissions for Under-grant Hold Bandwidth conditions."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 100 SC 100.2.9.5.3 P 105 L 2 # 3951  
 Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

Reference to "calculated as above," which above, there are lots of calculations above to  
 choose from.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Provide a specific reference to a section or table.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 100 SC 100.3.3 P 118 L 23 # 3962  
 Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies

Comment Type ER Comment Status D EZ

We do not have line cards, only CNUs and CLTs. All else is implementation

*SuggestedRemedy*

Strike "line card"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 100 SC 100.6.3.3 P 125 L 36 # 3889  
 Lusted, Kent Intel

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

text in TST3 value/comment box is different size from rest

*SuggestedRemedy*

fix as appropriate

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
 Will check and fix as needed.

Cl 100 SC 100.6.3.3 P 125 L 40 # 3890  
 Lusted, Kent Intel  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ  
 text in TST4 value/comment box is different size from rest  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 fix as appropriate  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
 Will check and fix as needed.

Cl 100 SC 100.6.3.3 P 126 L 6 # 3887  
 Lusted, Kent Intel  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ  
 text in ES2 value/comment box is 2 different sizes  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 fix as appropriate  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
 Will check and fix as needed.

Cl 100 SC 100.6.3.3 P 126 L 6 # 3888  
 Lusted, Kent Intel  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ  
 text in ES4 value/comment box is different size from rest  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 fix as appropriate  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
 Will check and fix as needed.

Cl 100 SC 2.12.3 P 115 L 8 # 3858  
 McDermott, Thomas Fujitsu  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ  
 The term 'complex scalar' is not correct. A scalar is a real number, whilst a 'complex number' is a vector. Each term in the preceding equation is in fact a single complex number for each subcarrier. The  $|e|^{/2}$  operation converts the error vector (a complex number) to a scalar, which is then time-averaged.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change 'complex scalar' to 'complex number'.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 100 SC 2.7.3 P 90 L 51 # 3855  
 McDermott, Thomas Fujitsu  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ  
 Typographical error, specifies GHz, should specify MHz.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change 3276.75 GHz to 3276.75 MHz.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 100 SC 3.4 P 118 L 47 # 3990  
 Amason, Dale Freescale  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ  
 Poor grammar: "shall be meet"  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change to "shall meet"  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 100 SC 3.4 P 119 L 43 # 4003  
 Effenberger, Frank Huawei

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

There is a sentence: "The easiest way of validating that the transmitted waveform is as intended to should be employed." This is poorly worded.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Recommend replacing sentence with, "The transmitted waveform should be validated in the most practical method available."  
 (However, does this sentence really add anything? It seems self-evident.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Delete this sentence.

Cl 100A SC 100A.2 P 354 L 19 # 3881  
 Anslow, Pete Ciena

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

An error rate would be errors per unit time (e.g., errors per second). Errors are usually characterised as the number of errors divided by the number of bits, so "Error rate simulation..." should be "Error ratio simulation..."

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change "Error rate simulation..." to "Error ratio simulation..."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 101 SC P 177 L 13 # 4095  
 Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

"on a excluded"

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change to  
 "on an excluded"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 101 SC 101 P 127 L 24 # 4161  
 Dawe, Piers Mellanox

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

ts

*SuggestedRemedy*

its

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 101 SC 101.1.2 P 127 L 29 # 4131  
 Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

Mnemonics introduced without full meaning:  
 "The operation of EPoC MPCP, as ..."

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change to

In 29 "The operation of EPoC Multipoint Control Protocol (MPCP), as ..."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.



Cl 101 SC 101.3.2.1.5 P 140 L 44 # 4133  
 Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ  
 countDelete should be in 101.3.2.1.3 Counters not 101.3.2.1.2 Variables  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Move per comment.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 101 SC 101.3.2.4 P 141 L 40 # 4134  
 Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ  
 "The 10GPASS-XR encodes"  
 Also pg 142 line 2 "PCS operating on CCDN"  
 Similar problem pg 157 line 44 for "The 10GPASS-XR decodes" and "PCS operating on CCDN" (2x)  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 change to  
 "The 10GPASS-XR PHY encodes" &  
 "The 10GPASS-XR PHY decodes" &  
 "PCS operating on a CCDN"  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 101 SC 101.3.2.5.1 P 144 L 1 # 3992  
 Hidaka, Yasuo Fujitsu Lab. of America  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ  
 LDPC in captions of table 101-4 and table 101-5 should be LDPC.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change LDPC in captions of table 101-4 and table 101-5 with "DPC".  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 101 SC 101.3.2.5.2 P 145 L 14 # 3780  
 Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ  
 Missing "."  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Add missing "."  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 101 SC 101.3.2.5.2 P 145 L 30 # 3806  
 Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D EZ  
 Is there any reason for the use of a hyphen in "LDPC-encoder"? We have "FEC Encoder",  
 "64B/66B Encoder", but "LDPC-encoder" ????  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change all instances of "LDPC-encoder" to "LDPC Encoder", including figures  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Replace the 2 instances found on pg 145 ln 30 and 31.

Cl 101 SC 101.3.2.5.2 P 145 L 30 # 3781  
 Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ  
 "The resulting FP bits" should be "The resulting F>>P<< bits", where >>p<< is in subscript to  
 match the following text / figures.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 101 SC 101.3.2.5.2 P 145 L 31 # 3807  
Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks

Comment Type T Comment Status D EZ

The values "(14400 - 60 = 14340 bits)" are just examples for one specific LDPC codeword size, and not universally applicable.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change "(14400 - 60 = 14340 bits)" to "(e.g., 14400 - 60 = 14340 bits)". The same change on page 145, line 33 where another specific numeric example is given.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Per comment, note that on line these is an "i.e.," that should be removed.

CI 101 SC 101.3.2.5.2 P 145 L 32 # 3864  
Anslow, Pete Ciena

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

spurious space after "(" at the end of the line causes the "(" to be on a different line from "14400"

*SuggestedRemedy*

Delete the space,

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See Cmt# 3807

CI 101 SC 101.3.2.5.2 P 146 L 47 # 3810  
Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks

Comment Type T Comment Status D EZ

"each FEC codeword (FEC CW)" - this is an odd place to add an acronym, which his used only within Figure 101-7.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Remove "(FEC CW)" statement. In Figure 101–7, change "FEC CW1" to "FEC<n>codeword 1" (<n> = newline) and do the same change for "FEC CW2" - there is plenty of space to use.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 101 SC 101.3.2.5.2 P 147 L 43 # 3782  
Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

There are two instances in Figure 101-7 of "65 bit block" which should be "65-bit block" - "65 bit" is an adjective in here

*SuggestedRemedy*

Per comment

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 101 SC 101.3.2.5.4 P 148 L 10 # 3811  
Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks

Comment Type T Comment Status D EZ

What does it mean: "Each codeword size has an associate US Filling Threshold FT with a specific threshold for each codeword size." - it seems like a circular definition at this time.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Seems that "Each codeword size has a specific, associated US Filling Threshold FT." would be sufficient

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 101 SC 101.3.2.5.4 P 148 L 10 # 3793  
Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks

Comment Type ER Comment Status D EZ

In many locations in Clause 100, 103, and 102, variables are italicized for better readability. Clause 101 is kind of in between, with some variables italicized and some not.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Consider italicizing variable names for better readability - applicable to the whole draft!

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Italicized and variable names not noticed as such.

CI 101 SC 101.3.2.5.4 P 148 L 10 # 3783  
Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

"associate US Filling Threshold FT" - "associate" or "associated" ???

SuggestedRemedy

I think adjective here ("associated") is correct. "Associate" (noun / verb) is not.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
See Cmt# 3811

CI 101 SC 101.3.2.5.5 P 149 L 1 # 3814  
Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks

Comment Type T Comment Status D EZ

Overqualification: "The fixed size in bits of the downstream FEC LDPC output codeword."

SuggestedRemedy

Change to "The size (expressed in bits) of the downstream FEC codeword." - once FEC is defined as LDPC, no need to repeat that over and over again ;)

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
Change to  
"The fixed size, in bits, of the downstream FEC codeword."

CI 101 SC 101.3.2.5.6 P 151 L 11 # 4083  
Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

wording:  
This variable used for counting

SuggestedRemedy

This variable is used for counting  
^^

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 101 SC 101.3.2.5.6 P 151 L 8 # 3787  
Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

Variable formatting (for umth time): "left-most bit is tx\_coded\_out<0> and the right-most bit is tx\_coded\_out<FC-1>."

SuggestedRemedy

Be consistent with the way variable names are italicized !

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
See Cmt# 3793

CI 101 SC 101.3.2.5.7 P 151 L 21 # 3788  
Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

Inconsistent formatting for hex number: 0x D8 58 E4 AB

SuggestedRemedy

change "0x D8 58 E4 AB" to "0xD858E4AB" or "0xD8-58-E4-AB" if you want to separate out individual 8 bit values.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
"0xD858E4AB"

CI 101 SC 101.3.2.5.7 P 152 L 8 # 3845  
Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks

Comment Type T Comment Status D EZ

Reference to CRC40 calculation should be added

SuggestedRemedy

Insert "(see 101.3.2.3)" after "CRC40 value"  
Make the link live

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.



Cl 101 SC 101.3.2.5.7 P 153 L 28 # 3789  
 Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ  
 Dead references: "Figure 100-3 and 100.2.9.7"  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Per comment  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 101 SC 101.3.2.5.8 P 154 L 21 # 3848  
 Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D EZ  
 Seemingly incorrect state name: RECEIVE\_FIFO\_HEAD  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change to REMOVE\_FIFO\_HEAD - that is what is happening here, we're dropping FIFO head elements until the size reaches the value of 2.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 101 SC 101.3.2.5.8 P 154 L 26 # 3993  
 Slavick, Jeff Avago Technologies  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ  
 FIFO\_FEC\_TX[sizeFifo] has a { instead of [  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Make the { a [  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 101 SC 101.3.2.5.8 P 154 L 27 # 3847  
 Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D EZ  
 Incorrect opening bracket: FIFO\_FEC\_TX[sizeFifo]  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change to FIFO\_FEC\_TX[sizeFifo]  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 101 SC 101.3.2.5.8 P 155 L 31 # 3818  
 Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D EZ  
 Unknown variables "FC", "FR" - are these intended to be "F>>C<<" and "F>>R<<", where >><< designated subscript?  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Per comment  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 101 SC 101.3.3.1.3 P 160 L 16 # 4084  
 Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ  
 formatting of "Extract BQ 65B Blocks"  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 subscript the "Q"  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 101 SC 101.3.3.1.7 P 162 L 49 # 4085  
 Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ  
 double double ref ref "per Table 101-2 or Table 101-2)"  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 remove one ref  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 101 SC 101.4.1.1 P 168 L 31 # 4087  
 Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ  
 "was just update by the above actions ..."  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change to  
 "was just updated by the above actions ..."  
 ^  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 101 SC 101.4.1.1 P 169 L 3 # 3938  
 Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ  
 What?  
 "When bit this variable is set"  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change to: "When this variable is set"  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 101 SC 101.4.1.1.1 P 169 L 3 # 3966  
 Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D EZ  
 We haven't specified when DS/US\_PrflCpy is cleared.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Add to each definition:  
 "The PHY sets this variable to zero on or before indicating the copy process has completed."  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 101 SC 101.4.1.3.1 P 170 L 16 # 4088  
 Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ  
 "been prepared for by the"  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change to:  
 "been prepared by the"  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 101 SC 101.4.2.11 P 191 L 32 # 3866  
 Anslow, Pete Ciena  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ  
 Numbers should be separated from their unit with a non-breaking space (Ctrl space) to avoid the number and the unit being on different lines  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Replace the space with a non-breaking space (Ctrl space):  
 Page 191, line 32 "204.8 Msamples"  
 Page 197, line 13 "22 MHz"  
 Page 218, line 49 "2.78 dB"  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 101 SC 101.4.2.11.1 P 191 L 45 # 4089  
 Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ  
 Stray period and space before ref, none after:  
 "See . 100.2.7.3"  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 -> "See 100.2.7.3."  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 101 SC 101.4.2.12 P 193 L 50 # 3867  
 Anslow, Pete Ciena

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

1.2.6 Accuracy and resolution of numerical quantities states:  
 Unless otherwise stated, numerical limits in this standard are to be taken as exact, with the number of significant digits and trailing zeros having no significance.  
 Consequently, the entries in Table 101-11 and 101.18 should not contain trailing zeros.

*SuggestedRemedy*

In Table 101-11 and Table 101.18, change:  
 "0.0000" to "0"  
 "0.6250" to "0.625"  
 "1.2500" to "1.25"

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 101 SC 101.4.2.3 P 172 L 44 # 4114  
 Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies

Comment Type T Comment Status D EZ

Why does this equation not include a factor for the windowing?

*SuggestedRemedy*

Include a windowing factor (DSNrp)

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 The windowing is eaten by the next CP.

CI 101 SC 101.4.2.4.5 P 174 L 10 # 3699  
 Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

Spurious "|" in line 10

*SuggestedRemedy*

Remove "|"

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 101 SC 101.4.2.6.1 P 176 L 39 # 4048  
 Trowbridge, Steve Alcatel-Lucent

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

At least one misalignment in Figure 101-18: the box around the "P" (preamble) box to the right of the PHY LINK box is offset slightly higher than the rest of the line

*SuggestedRemedy*

Zoom in close and nudge the elements to line up and tidy up the figure

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 101 SC 101.4.2.6.4 P 179 L 32 # 4119  
 Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies

Comment Type T Comment Status D EZ

Clarify which value of NCP is being referred to:  
 "decrementing the value of NPC by one"

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change to:  
 "decrementing the initial value of NPC by one"

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 Perhaps this step will require reiteration. Therefore leave as is.

CI 101 SC 101.4.2.7 P 180 L 15 # 4049  
 Trowbridge, Steve Alcatel-Lucent

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

Some misalignment in Figure 101-19. The arrow down to the lower left XOR crosses slightly over the line above. If the arrows down from the Seed (0x4732BA) box were intended to touch the box, they don't.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Zoom in close and nudge the elements to line up where intended

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 101 SC 101.4.2.8.1 P 180 L 36 # 4096  
 Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

Several links not correct and/or live  
 In 36: 101.4.3.6.4 should be 101.4.2.7.  
 In 37: 101.4.3.6.x should be ???  
 In 40: 101.4.2.1 should be 101.3.2.5.6

*SuggestedRemedy*

Make links live with correct SCI number per comment

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Ref @ line 37 s/b to 101.4.2.8.7

CI 101 SC 101.4.2.9.2 P 185 L 41 # 4098  
 Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

Verb tense "If NI were not divisible ... branches would not be filled."

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change to "If NI is not divisible ... branches are not filled."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 101 SC 101.4.2.9.3 P 186 L 24 # 4121  
 Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies

Comment Type T Comment Status D EZ

We have no "Figure 4"

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change to: "Figure 101-23", make live

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 101 SC 101.4.2.9.3 P 186 L 8 # 3865  
 Anslow, Pete Ciena

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

This says "arranged in a 2-D store". However, the term "2D" is used in Clause 55 for two-dimensional without the hyphen.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change all 11 instances of "2-D" in the draft to "2D"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
 Impacts CI 101 & 102

CI 101 SC 101.4.3.2.3 P 198 L 11 # 3868  
 Anslow, Pete Ciena

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

Cross-referenced to other sub-clauses in IEEE standards are not preceded by "Section"

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change "as specified in Section 101.4.3.2.2" to "as specified in 101.4.3.2.2"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 101 SC 101.4.3.3.6 P 201 L 1 # 3981  
 Booth, Brad Microsoft

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

Figure 101-29 font size is inconsistent with previous figures.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Correct the font size.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
 Per IEEE Style guide fonts in graphic are to be either Times New Roman or Arial. Most SD in the current STD are in Arial. P802.3bn will use Arial (9 pt preferred) for SD.

Cl 101 SC 101.4.3.4.5 P 203 L 26 # 4091  
 Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ  
 Stray variables section  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Remove  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
 Do last to keep numbering consistent with comments

Cl 101 SC 101.4.3.7.1 P 212 L 15 # 3869  
 Anslow, Pete Ciena  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ  
 "RB\_Type" and "RB\_Frame\_start" are split across two lines, which is a bad thing to do with variable names.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Tell FrameMaker not to hyphenate these two variable names. (Click on the variable name and type Esc n s to do this)  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 101 SC 101.4.3.9.2 P 218 L 45 # 3870  
 Anslow, Pete Ciena  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ  
 The 802.3 web page:  
[http://www.ieee802.org/3/WG\\_tools/editorial/requirements/words.html](http://www.ieee802.org/3/WG_tools/editorial/requirements/words.html)  
 says that 802.3 will use "peak-to-peak" (in text)  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change "p-p" to "peak-to-peak" 4 times in 101.4.3.9.2  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 101 SC 101.6.2 P 227 L 1 # 3871  
 Anslow, Pete Ciena  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ  
 101.6.2 and 101.6.2.2 should be on the same page as the heading for 101.6  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Click on the heading 101.6.2.2, Paragraph designer pod, Pagination tab, uncheck Keep With Next Pgf (box goes white), Apply.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 101 SC 101.6.4.2 P 228 L 29 # 3874  
 Anslow, Pete Ciena  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ  
 "Transmssion" should be "Transmission"  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change "Transmssion" to "Transmission"  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 101 SC 101.6.4.2 P 228 L 29 # 4072  
 Regev, Alon Ixia  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ  
 "Transmssion" should be "Transmission"  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change "Transmssion" to "Transmission"  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 101 SC Figure 101-8 P 154 L 27 # 3991  
 Amason, Dale Freescale  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ  
 Lone curly bracket { in "FIFO\_FEC\_TX{sizeFifo}"  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Replace with [  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 102 SC 102.1 P 235 L 5 # 4159  
 Dawe, Piers Mellanox  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ  
 its'  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Remove the '  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 102 SC 102.1.2 P 238 L 24 # 4051  
 Trowbridge, Steve Alcatel-Lucent  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ  
 Misalignments in Figure 102-4. The four "to PMA" instances are all slightly different levels from each other and the arrows down to them are slightly different lengths.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Zoom in close and nudge the elements of the figure to line up  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 102 SC 102.1.4.1.1 P 239 L 39 # 3875  
 Anslow, Pete Ciena  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ  
 Tables 102-1 and 102-2 have blank cells filled with hyphens, but the IEEE style guide says that empty cells should contain em-dash  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Replace the hyphens in Tables 102-1 and 102-2 with em-dash  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
 Ctrl-q Shft-q

Cl 102 SC 102.1.8 P 243 L 12 # 3876  
 Anslow, Pete Ciena  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ  
 The IEEE Style manual contains:  
 "Ranges should repeat the unit (e.g., 115 V to 125 V). Dashes should never be used because they can be misconstrued as subtraction signs."  
 Hence, "(i.e., 0-99)" should be "(i.e., 0 to 99)"

Same issue in the first row of Table 102-6  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change "(i.e., 0-99)" to "(i.e., 0 to 99)"  
 In the first row of Table 102-6, change "0x00- 0x08" to "0x00 to 0x08"  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 102 SC 102.2.2 P 249 L 32 # 3985  
 Szczepanek, Andre Inphi  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ  
 Sentence  
 "Detection of the PHY Link is the first action a CNU must take to join an EPoC network."  
 is duplicated  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Remove duplicate  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
 CommentType was blank - set to E by Editor  
 Subclause did not include 102; corrected by editor

Cl 102 SC 102.2.3.1.1 P 251 L 28 # 3674  
 Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ  
 unnecessary "." in "Configuration ID and profile activation."  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Remove "."  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 102 SC 102.2.3.2 P 253 L 25 # 3877  
 Anslow, Pete Ciena

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

A hyphen is needed in "4-bit number" because both "4" and "bit" refer to "number". However, this is not the case for the right hand column of Table 102-9, where "xx-bits" should be "xx bits".

Same issue on page 304, line 20

*SuggestedRemedy*

Replace the hyphens with a space in the right hand column of Table 102-9 (3 instances) and also on page 304, line 20 (64 bits).

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 102 SC 102.3.5.7 P 267 L 6 # 4052  
 Trowbridge, Steve Alcatel-Lucent

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

At least one misalignment in figure 102-18: the arrow looping back into the WAIT state at the top goes beyond the line of the box.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Zoom in close and nudge the elements as appropriate to line up.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 102 SC 102.4.1.7 P 273 L 1 # 3878  
 Anslow, Pete Ciena

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

The title for 102.4.1.7 has "102.4.1.7" twice

*SuggestedRemedy*

Remove the second "102.4.1.7"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 102 SC 102.4.1.8.7 P 276 L 5 # 3982  
 Booth, Brad Microsoft

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

Figure 102-24, 102-29 and 102-30 are inconsistent in the font style and hard to read.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change to use the correct font. Fix the boxes to remove overhangs and thick lines.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Per IEEE Style guide fonts in graphic are to be either Times New Roman or Arial. Most SD in the current STD are in Arial. P802.3bn will use Arial (9 pt preferred) for SD.

CI 102 SC 102.5.2.2 P 287 L 34 # 4157  
 Dawe, Piers Mellanox

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

2012

*SuggestedRemedy*

201x 6 or more instances.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Clause was listed as 105 Editor changed to 102

CI 102 SC 102.5.2.2 P 287 L 34 # 3873  
 Anslow, Pete Ciena

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

"IEEE Std 802.3xx" should be "IEEE Std 802.3bn"

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change "IEEE Std 802.3xx" to "IEEE Std 802.3bn"

Page 8, line 4

Page 8, line 13

Page 8, line 14

Page 10, line 29

Page 287, line 34

Page 287, line 40

Page 345, line 26

Page 345, line 32

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 102 SC 102.5.4.3 P 289 L 25 # 3893  
 Lusted, Kent Intel  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ  
 Typo in value/comment box for "withing"  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 change to "within"  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 103 SC 103.1 P 295 L 21 # 3738  
 Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D EZ  
 "Clause 67 provides additional examples of P2MP topologies." - not for CCDN  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Remove statement  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 103 SC 103.1 P 296 L 25 # 3712  
 Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ  
 Missing serial comma in "Clause 100, Clause 101 and Clause 102"  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change to "Clause 100, Clause 101, and Clause 102"  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 103 SC 103.1.1 P 297 L 24 # 3747  
 Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D EZ  
 Goals and objectives NO MORE!  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 There is no value in listing goals and objectives - new projects do not define them at all.  
 Strike 103.1.1  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
 However I doubt you will get a TF formed without any objectives :-)

CI 103 SC 103.1.2 P 297 L 34 # 3748  
 Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D EZ  
 This statement is NOT correct in Clause 103: "Multipoint MAC Control defines the MAC control operation for optical point-to-multipoint networks."  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change to "Multipoint MAC Control specified in this clause defines the MAC control operation for coaxial distribution networks."

Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Change to: "Multipoint MAC Control in this clause defines the MAC control operation for point-to-multipoint networks over coaxial cable distribution networks."

CI 103 SC 103.1.2 P 299 L 44 # 4054  
 Trowbridge, Steve Alcatel-Lucent  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ  
 At least one misalignment in Figure 103-2: the MDI box at the bottom is misaligned with the coax box below

SuggestedRemedy  
 Zoom in close and nudge the elements of the figure to line up  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 103 SC 103.2.2.1 P 304 L 20 # 3713  
 Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ  
 VALUE or Value?

SuggestedRemedy  
 I believe "VALUE" would be more appropriate, given that we capitalize "TYPE" everywhere already  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.



CI 103 SC 103.2.2.4 P 308 L 12 # 3715  
Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

"PHY\_Overhead(). returns the number of octets that the PHY inserts during transmission of a particular packet."

SuggestedRemedy

Remove "." after "()" and before "returns"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 103 SC 103.2.2.4 P 308 L 27 # 3759  
Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks

Comment Type TR Comment Status D EZ

XGMII\_Rate and PCS\_Rate is not defined in Clause 103. They are defined in Clause 101, but they should be listed as variables / constants in 103.2.2.3 and then point back to definition in Clause 101

SuggestedRemedy

Per comment

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 103 SC 103.2.2.4 P 308 L 8 # 3724  
Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks

Comment Type ER Comment Status D EZ

In other locations, parameters were italicized and here they are present in " for some reason. The same observation in line 12

SuggestedRemedy

Consider using consistent markup for parameters and variables as italicized values, which are much more readable than parameter names marked in "

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
remove single quotes and italicize variable.

CI 103 SC 103.2.2.7 P 313 L 38 # 3725  
Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks

Comment Type ER Comment Status D EZ

Text in "SEND FRAME" state uses different font size and type than other states - please align

SuggestedRemedy

Per comment

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
Good catch. Change "MAC:MA\_DATA.request(DA,SA,m\_sdu\_tx)" to Ariel 8 pt to be consistent with template and rest of figure.

CI 103 SC 103.3.1 P 315 L 9 # 3726  
Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks

Comment Type ER Comment Status D EZ

Text style !!!

SuggestedRemedy

Use the proper text style in 103.3.1 and in 103.3.1

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
Good catch. Reset to para style T,Text !!!

CI 103 SC 103.3.3 P 315 L 48 # 3716  
Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

How much is "largely" ? 50%? 75%? Undefined quantifiers are not needed ...

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the word "largely"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.





Cl 30 SC 30.5.1.1.2 P 29 L 47 # 3644  
Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks

Comment Type T Comment Status D EZ

Attribute aMAUType makes reference to PHYs for different speeds, e.g.:

10GBASE-PR-D3 One single-mode fiber 10.3125 GBd continuous downstream / burst mode upstream OLT PHY as specified in Clause 75

Whereas aMAUType in this draft lists PCS/PMA for some reason:

Coax cable distribution network PCS/PMA continuous downstream / burst mode upstream as specified in Clause 101

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change

Coax cable distribution network PCS/PMA continuous downstream / burst mode upstream as specified in Clause 101

to

10GBASE-XR Coax cable distribution network PHY continuous downstream / burst mode upstream PHY as specified in Clause 101

*Proposed Response* Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
Change

"Coax cable distribution network PCS/PMA continuous downstream / burst mode upstream as specified in Clause 101"

to

"Coax cable distribution network PHY continuous downstream / burst mode upstream PHY as specified in Clause 101"

Cl 45 SC P 36 L 6 # 4180  
Grow, Robert RMG Consulting

Comment Type TR Comment Status D EZ

P802.3bw is defining the value 111101 which you show as reserved. As written, this could remove that definition. P802.3bv does not seem to have defined a value (bit should).

P802.3bv is defining 110101. Together, the three amendments are creating a quite sparse matrix, which could push 802.3bs for the multiple port types it will define.  
Table 45-7

*SuggestedRemedy*

I see three options:

1. Change the draft to accommodate amendments expected to be approved prior to yours (e.g., 802.3bw).
2. Define the value and in the editorial instruction indicate that the publication editor should take care of fixing the reserved values (what I currently have in P802.3bv)
3. One amendment could change the list style to individually list the sixteen 11xxx reserved values (this would logically be P802.3bw, but could be P802.3bn). This would then allow all subsequent amendments to simply change one line in the cell.

*Proposed Response* Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
Set SCI to 45.2.1.6, Moved "Table 45-7" from SCI to Comment

Change Editors instruction from  
"Change Table 45-7 as follows:" to  
"Change row Table 45-7 follows (change "reserved" line(s) as appropriate for values defined by this and other approved amendments):"

Cl 45 SC 45.2.7a.6 P 62 L 45 # 3637  
Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks

Comment Type T Comment Status D EZ

Which are first two subcarriers? "Note that the first two subcarriers are not reflected and are always excluded."

*SuggestedRemedy*

Modify "Note that the first two subcarriers are not reflected and are always excluded." to read "Note that the first two subcarriers (i.e., subcarriers number 0 and 1) are not reflected in register group 12.10241 through 12.12287 (10GPASS-XR receive MER measurement registers)."

*Proposed Response* Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
Changed cmt to Cl 45 , ScI 45.2.7a.6, pg 62 ln 35.

CI 45 SC 2.7a.6 P 62 L 27 # 3854  
 McDermott, Thomas Fujitsu  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ  
 The word register is mis-spelled  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change reggister to register  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 45 SC 45.2 P 33 L 9 # 3645  
 Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ  
 "1.1899" in Table 45-3 should be shown in underline - this is the new value  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Underline "1.1899" in Table 45-3  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 45 SC 45.2.1 P 32 L 17 # 3899  
 Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ  
 We should be explicit about which table is being changed in the Editing Instruction  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 add " in Table 45-3 " so the instruction reads:  
 "Change the identified reserved row and insert a new row above it in Table 45-3 as follows  
 (unchanged rows not shown):"  
 Editor to review all editing instructions in CI 45 and make similar changes as needed.  
 Editor to ensure all editing instructions end with a colon.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
 See Cmt 3935

CI 45 SC 45.2.1 P 32 L 30 # 3935  
 Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ  
 Specifically stating the number of new rows in probably not a good idea as it is likely to get out  
 of sync with the draft.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Remove " 30" from editing instruction, (add "in Table 45-3" after "below it so Editing Instruction  
 reads:  
 "Change the identified reserved row and insert new rows below it in Table 45-3 as follows  
 (unchanged rows not shown):"  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
 See Cmt 3899

CI 45 SC 45.2.1 P 34 L 24 # 3882  
 Anslow, Pete Ciena  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D EZ  
 In the second to last row of Table 45-3 "1.1952 through 1.1957" should be "1.1953 through  
 1.1957"  
 In the last row of Table 45-3 "1.1952 through 1.32767" should be "1.1958 through 1.32767"  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 In the second to last row of Table 45-3, change "1.1952" to "1.1953"  
 In the last row of Table 45-3, change "1.1952" to "1.1958"  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 45 SC 45.2.1 P 34 L 25 # 3646  
 Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D EZ  
 In Table 45-3, "1.1952 through 1.32767" and "1.1952 through 1.1957" are incorrect.  
 Register 1.1952 is already in three times !!!  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change "1.1952 through 1.1957" to "1.1953 through 1.1958"  
 Change "1.1952 through 1.32767" to "1.1959 through 1.32767"  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 45 SC 45.2.1 P 34 L 25 # 4179  
 Grow, Robert RMG Consulting  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D EZ  
 Reserved registers overlap registers defined in row above.  
 Table 45-3  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change 1.1952 to 1.1958.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
 Set SCI to 45.2.1, moved "Table 45-3" from SCI to Comment

CI 45 SC 45.2.1.131 P 37 L 48 # 3650  
 Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ  
 Bit register 1.1900.10 is marked as "R/w" and should be "R/W"  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Per comment  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 45 SC 45.2.1.131.3 P 38 L 27 # 3936  
 Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ  
 Incomplete sentence: "When bit 1.1900.2 is used to control marking of frames with CRC40 errors to higher layers as described in 101.3.3.1.4."  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Strike the "When"  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 45 SC 45.2.1.131.4 P 38 L 39 # 3656  
 Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ  
 "The default value for bit 1.1900.1 is zero." - "zero" or "a zero"? I find more instances of where "a zero" and "a one" is used than "zero" / "one" with no preceding article.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Consider aligning the use of articles before "one" / "zero"  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Globally change "a zero" to "zero" (14x) and "a one" to "one" (25x)

CI 45 SC 45.2.1.132 P 39 L 7 # 3658  
 Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ  
 "normal operations" - likely, "normal operation" or "normal operating conditions"  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Per comment  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Change to: "operation"

CI 45 SC 45.2.1.132.1 P 39 L 24 # 3660  
 Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ  
 Seems like two sentences got glued together: "When bit 1.1901.15 is set to a one the output port of the CLT is muted for testing purposes, when this bit is set to a zero the CLT operates as normal (see 100.1.3)".  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change to "When bit 1.1901.15 is set to a one, the output port of the CLT is muted for testing purposes. When this bit is set to a zero, the CLT operates as normal (see 100.1.3)." - note that there are other comments modifying this sentence as well  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 45 SC 45.2.1.132.1 P 39 L 24 # 3659  
Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

"When bit 1.1901.15 is set to a one the output port" - missing comma after "a one"

*SuggestedRemedy*

Scrub remaining register bit definitions to make sure that the comma is not missing. There are at least 3 more instances I found when looking at them in a cursory fashion

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 45 SC 45.2.1.132.4 P 39 L 44 # 3664  
Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

Formatting inconsistency for "DSNr" - it is italicized everywhere else

*SuggestedRemedy*

Italicize it

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 45 SC 45.2.1.134 P 41 L 10 # 3667  
Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

Contrary to state diagrams, we are not very pressed for space in Clause 45 when defining register/ bit names.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Rename "Rnd" to "Random seed" in Table 45-98d and title of 45.2.1.134.1

Rename "RB size" to "Resource Block size" in Table 45-98d and title of 45.2.1.134.2

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 45 SC 45.2.1.134.2 P 41 L 28 # 3668  
Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

Missing space in "RB size(1.1907.7)" between register name and opening paren

*SuggestedRemedy*

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 45 SC 45.2.1.134.2 P 41 L 31 # 3937  
Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

Missing "the variable" before RBsize

*SuggestedRemedy*

Add

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 45 SC 45.2.1.136.1 P 42 L 38 # 3671  
Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks

Comment Type ER Comment Status D EZ

missing reference in "reflection of the variable Type2\_Repeat defined in ."

*SuggestedRemedy*

Add the missing reference

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Add: "101.4.3.6.1"

CI 45 SC 45.2.1.137 P 43 L 15 # 4057  
Zimmerman, George CME Consulting, Inc.

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

typo - "it not being modified" should be "is not being modified" - 2 instances, lines 15 and 25

*SuggestedRemedy*

replace "it" with "is" on lines 15 & 25.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**CI 45**    **SC 45.2.1.137.2**    **P 43**    **L 44**    # **3941**  
 Remein, Duane    Huawei Technologies

**Comment Type**    **E**    **Comment Status**    **D**    **EZ**  
 Stray "." in "initiated.and"

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Replace with space

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

**CI 45**    **SC 45.2.1.140**    **P 45**    **L 18**    # **3676**  
 Hajduczenia, Marek    Bright House Networks

**Comment Type**    **E**    **Comment Status**    **D**    **EZ**  
 "with bit 1.1913.0 being the LSB and bit 1.1914.15 bring the MSB" - likely, "bring" should be "being"

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Per comment

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

**CI 45**    **SC 45.2.1.140**    **P 45**    **L 20**    # **3677**  
 Hajduczenia, Marek    Bright House Networks

**Comment Type**    **E**    **Comment Status**    **D**    **EZ**  
 "this process which is fully described in 102.4.1" - no need to qualify whether it is fully or not fully described somewhere else

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Change "this process which is fully described in 102.4.1" to "this process is described in 102.4.1"

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

**CI 45**    **SC 45.2.1.141.1**    **P 46**    **L 3**    # **3679**  
 Hajduczenia, Marek    Bright House Networks

**Comment Type**    **T**    **Comment Status**    **D**    **EZ**  
 Unnecessarily wordy definition and uses style different from other register definitions.

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Change to read:

Bit 1.1915.15 indicate if the associated CNU\_ID value has been assigned to a CNU. When bit 1.1915.15 is set to a one, the associated CNU\_ID has been assigned to a CNU. When bit 1.1915.15 is set to a zero, the associated CNU\_ID has not been assigned. See 102.4.1.6 and 102.4.3 for additional details on the use of bit 1.1915.15. This bit is a reflection of the variable AssgndCNU\_ID defined in 102.4.1.8.2.

**Proposed Response**    **Response Status**    **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Change  
 "The value of bit 1.1915.15, is used to indicate if the associated CNU\_ID value has been assigned to a CNU by the PHY. When the flag is set to a one the associated CNU\_ID has been assigned to a new CNU whereas when the flag is set to zero the associated CNU\_ID has not been assigned."  
 to  
 "Bit 1.1915.15 indicates if the associated CNU\_ID value has been assigned to a CNU by the PHY. When this bit is set to one, the associated CNU\_ID has been assigned to a CNU. When set to zero, the associated CNU\_ID has not been assigned. "

**CI 45**    **SC 45.2.1.146**    **P 48**    **L 22**    # **3617**  
 Hajduczenia, Marek    Bright House Networks

**Comment Type**    **E**    **Comment Status**    **D**    **EZ**  
 "15 least significant bits of the PHY ranging offset register." is not a full sentence, remove "."

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Same for 1.1925.15:0 and 1.1926.15:0

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



Cl 45 SC 45.2.1.147 P 48 L 32 # 3618  
Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

Serial "and" and missing ","

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change "The DS PHY data rate registers 1.1927, 1.1928 and 1.1929" to "The DS PHY data rate registers 1.1927, 1.1928, and 1.1929"

Same change in 45.2.1.148

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 45 SC 45.2.1.147 P 48 L 34 # 3620  
Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks

Comment Type T Comment Status D EZ

"Register 1929 is the most significant part of this number with bit 1.1929.4 being the MSB while register 1927 is the least significant part with bit 1.1927.0 being the LSB. " - in previous registers, a much simpler (and clearer format) was used

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change to "Bit 1.1929.4 is the MSB and bit 1.1927.0 is the LSB of the value.". Simialr change needed in 45.2.1.148

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 45 SC 45.2.1.149 P 49 L 44 # 3625  
Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

missing space in "Total FEC codewords counter[15:0]" for 1.1933.15:0 and 1.1934.15:0

*SuggestedRemedy*

Insert missing space in front of "["

Simialr changes in Table 45–98t and Table 45–98u

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 45 SC 45.2.1.149 P 49 L 46 # 3626  
Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

Designators RO, R/W, NR, etc. are used with different formatting. In some register tables, they are listed one under another, with no "," between them (less common) and in others, one after another separated by ",".

*SuggestedRemedy*

Align the format. Make sure that where multiple designators are listed, they are listed one after another and separated with ",". One immediate location where fix is needed is Table 45–98g

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Check all tables with multiple entries, use comma space " ," for separator.

Cl 45 SC 45.2.1.14a.1 P 37 L 25 # 3649  
Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks

Comment Type ER Comment Status D EZ

"When read as a one, bit 1.17.1 indicates that the PMA/PMD is able to operate as " - in the scope of this document, "PMA/PMD" is clear enough. When merged into the main standard, "PMA/PMD" will become ambiguous

*SuggestedRemedy*

Add qualifier "10GPASS-XR" before each "PMA/PMD" and "PHY" instance in Clause 45. In this case, change "When read as a one, bit 1.17.1 indicates that the PMA/PMD is able to operate as " to "When read as a one, bit 1.17.1 indicates that the 10GPASS-XR PMA/PMD is able to operate as "

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

In this instance the useage is correct as is since the first PMA/PMD refers to the one being read via MDIO not a specific type of PMA/PMD and is consistent with the rest of Clause 45: "When read as a one, bit 1.17.1 indicates that the PMA/PMD is able to operate as a 10GPASS-XR-D PMA/PMD type."

A quick scan of the 110 instance of PMA/PMD indicates they are all either proper as is or clear from context.

**Cl 45**    **SC 45.2.1.152**                      **P 51**                      **L 5**                      # **3627**  
Hajduczenia, Marek                      Bright House Networks

**Comment Type**    **E**                      **Comment Status**    **D**                      **EZ**  
missing space in "RO,NR"

**SuggestedRemedy**  
insert missing space

The same in Table 45–98w, Table 45–98x, Table 45–98y, Table 45–98z, Table 45–98aa, Table 45–98ab, Table 45–98ac,

**Proposed Response**                      **Response Status**    **W**  
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
see cmt# 3626

**Cl 45**    **SC 45.2.1.153**                      **P 51**                      **L 21**                      # **4058**  
Zimmerman, George                      CME Consulting, Inc.

**Comment Type**    **E**                      **Comment Status**    **D**                      **EZ**  
spelling "recieved"

**SuggestedRemedy**  
replace "recieved" with "received"

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

**Cl 45**    **SC 45.2.1.161**                      **P 54**                      **L 19**                      # **3628**  
Hajduczenia, Marek                      Bright House Networks

**Comment Type**    **E**                      **Comment Status**    **D**                      **EZ**  
"0 = DS data path 32-QAM modulation not supported" seems to have an extra space at teh begining, making it right shifted relative to other descriptions in this table

**SuggestedRemedy**  
Remove the extra space / align the text left.

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

**Cl 45**    **SC 45.2.1.161.3**                      **P 54**                      **L 30**                      # **3896**  
Remein, Duane                                      Huawei Technologies

**Comment Type**    **E**                      **Comment Status**    **D**                      **EZ**  
typo: "bits indicates"

**SuggestedRemedy**  
to: "bits indicate"

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

**Cl 45**    **SC 45.2.1.162**                      **P 55**                      **L 24**                      # **3629**  
Hajduczenia, Marek                      Bright House Networks

**Comment Type**    **T**                      **Comment Status**    **D**                      **EZ**  
Bit 1.1949.15 seems like a binary flag (yes / no). It is customary to define the values in Description field then

**SuggestedRemedy**  
Change "Value of PHY Link differential TS is valid" to  
"1 = value of PHY Link differential TS is valid  
0 = value of PHY Link differential TS is not valid"

Change text in 45.2.1.162.1 to use "one" and "zero" spelled out for consistency. Also, the sentence form needs alignment with the description of ther registers for EPoC.

When bit 1.1949.15 is read as a one, the value in PHY Link differential TS is valid. When bit 1.1949.15 is read as a zero, the value in PHY Link differential TS is not invalid. This bit is a reflection of the PhyLnkDiffTS\_Valid variable defined in 101.5.1.

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

**Cl 45**    **SC 45.2.1.164**                      **P 56**                      **L 31**                      # **3690**  
Hajduczenia, Marek                      Bright House Networks

**Comment Type**    **E**                      **Comment Status**    **D**                      **EZ**  
"The assignment of bits in the US target receive power register " - one too many "register" instance

**SuggestedRemedy**  
remove one of "register" instances

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

CI 45 SC 45.2.1.165 P 57 L 1 # 3692  
Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks

Comment Type T Comment Status D EZ

Table 45–98ai contains several b) footnotes, which should be converted into text

*SuggestedRemedy*

Remove all b) footnotes from Table 45–98ai.  
Insert the followi text: "Bits 1.1953.8:0 are valid only for 10GBASS-XR-D PMA/PMD. Bits 1.1953.8:0 are reserved for 10GBASS-XR-U PMA/PMD and always read as zero." in 45.2.1.165.1 and then applied also to other subclauses: 45.2.1.165.2, 45.2.1.165.3, 45.2.1.165.4, and 45.2.1.165.5, with chanes to bit numbers.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 45 SC 45.2.1.4 P 34 L 38 # 3647  
Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks

Comment Type ER Comment Status D EZ

Reserved registers were aligned under 802.3bx D3.0 - please align per i-51  
([http://www.ieee802.org/3/bx/comments/P8023-D3p0-Comments\\_Final\\_byCls.pdf](http://www.ieee802.org/3/bx/comments/P8023-D3p0-Comments_Final_byCls.pdf))

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change "Reserved for future speeds" to "Reserved"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.  
The comment response for referenced i-51 only states "Change the two instances of "reserved for future use" to "reserved" and does not include changing "Reserved for future speeds" Draft 3.2 of 802.3bx still includes "Reserved for future speeds" in this table row as do several other tables in CI 45 outside the scope of 802.3bn. Perhaps a maintance request should be entered by the commentor.

CI 45 SC 45.2.1.6 P 35 L 10 # 3648  
Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks

Comment Type ER Comment Status D EZ

Reserved reserved registers were marked as RO under 802.3bx D3.0 - please align per i-51  
([http://www.ieee802.org/3/bx/comments/P8023-D3p0-Comments\\_Final\\_byCls.pdf](http://www.ieee802.org/3/bx/comments/P8023-D3p0-Comments_Final_byCls.pdf))

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change 1.7.15:10 to RO  
Change 1.7.7:6 to RO

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 45 SC 45.2.1.6 P 35 L 3 # 4065  
Zimmerman, George CME Consulting, Inc.

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

Editing instruction is "Change", changes are hard to find becausee they are not until the next page - recommend just having the changed entries, rather than the entire table, as other drafts are changing this.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Just show the changed rows.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
Remove 1st part of table (Bits 1.7.15:10, 1.7.9, .1.7.8 & 1.7.7:6)

Change editing instruction to read:  
"Change Table 45–7 as follows (unchanged rows not shown):"

CI 45 SC 45.2.7a P 58 L 5 # 3693  
Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

Sentence missin "." and also does not read riht

*SuggestedRemedy*

Chane "The assignment registers of in the OFDM MMD is shown in Table 45–211a" to "The assignment registers in the OFDM MMD is shown in Table 45–211a."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
Move "of" between "assignment" and "registers" in the sentence and add period so it reads:  
"The assignment of registers in the OFDM MMD is shown in Table 45–211a."

CI 45 SC 45.2.7a.1.1 P 58 L 45 # 3939  
Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

More accurately  
"the OFDM descriptor" is "OFDM DS profile descriptor"

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change to  
"OFDM descriptor" to "OFDM DS profile descriptor" in 2 places in this para.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 45 SC 45.2.7a.1.1 P 58 L 48 # 3695  
 Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ  
 missin "." at the end of line 48  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 chane "defined in 101.4.2.4.5" to "defined in 101.4.2.4.5."  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 45 SC 45.2.7a.2 P 59 L 13 # 3697  
 Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D EZ  
 Ambiguous what "these registers" means in "Changing these registers does not affect the"  
 mean. Also, no need to mention active profile here  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change "Changing these registers does not affect the active profile, only the inactive profile" to  
 "Changing registers 12.1 through 12.1023 affects only the inactive profile"  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 45 SC 45.2.7a.2 P 59 L 16 # 3698  
 Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ  
 Missing "." in line 16  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Add missing "." at the end of sentence  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 45 SC 45.2.7a.2 P 59 L 5 # 4036  
 Trowbridge, Steve Alcatel-Lucent  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ  
 Comprise means "includes", so I think is not the right word here since the subcarriers are the  
 signal which is different than the channel  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 replace with "the 4096 subcarriers that are transmitted over the OFDM channel"  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 45 SC 45.2.7a.2 P 59 L 9 # 3696  
 Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D EZ  
 It would be helpful to specify what "first four subcarriers" means  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Add "(i.e., subcarriers number 0 through 3)" after "first four subcarriers"  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 45 SC 45.2.7a.3 P 60 L 6 # 4037  
 Trowbridge, Steve Alcatel-Lucent  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ  
 Misuse of "comprise"  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 replace with "4096 subcarriers that are transmitted over the OFDMA channel". Same issue  
 clause 45.2.7a.4 p61 line 6, clause 45.2.7a.6 p62 line 32, clause 101.4.2.4.5 p174 line 20,  
 clause 101.4.3.4.4 p203 line 5, clause 101.4.3.9.3 p219 lines 24 and 31  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 45 SC 45.2.7a.4 P 61 L 5 # 3940  
 Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

"part" s/b "parts"

at line 8 & 9

"register pair (12.2050 and 12.2051) respectively control" s/b

"register pair (12.2050 and 12.2051), respectively controls"

"(12.10238 and 12.10239) control" s/b

"(12.10238 and 12.10239) controls"

at line 13

"12.2049 respectively" s/b "12.2049, respectively"

SuggestedRemedy

per comment

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 45 SC 45.2.7a.4 P 61 L 8 # 3701  
 Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

"the imaginary number setting for subcarrier 0 and so on" - since this is a complete example,

"so on" is not needed

SuggestedRemedy

Remove "and so on"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 45 SC 45.2.7a.6 P 62 L 27 # 3638  
 Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

What are "reggisters" in "10GPASS-XR receive MER measurement reggisters"

SuggestedRemedy

Replace "reggisters" with "registers"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 45 SC 45.2.7a.6 P 62 L 27 # 4070  
 Regev, Alon Ixia

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

"registers" misspelled as "reggisters"

SuggestedRemedy

change "reggisters" to "registers"

Also fix in Table of Contents

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 56 SC 1.2.1 P 67 L 54 # 3987  
 Amason, Dale Freescale

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

Figure 56-4 entered twice.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace second instance of Figure 56-4 with Figure 56-4a

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 56 SC 1.2.2 P 69 L 20 # 3988  
 Amason, Dale Freescale

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

Missing underline for added text "Clause 101".

SuggestedRemedy

Add underline.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 56 SC 56.1 P 67 L 15 # 3703  
Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

"Furthermore, EFM also introduces the concept of EPON Protocol over Coax (EPoC)" - but we also have statement "EFM also introduces the concept of Ethernet Passive Optical Networks (EPONs)", making it a list of "also" statements looking just odd

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change "EFM also introduces the concept of Ethernet Passive Optical Networks (EPONs)" to "EFM introduces the concept of Ethernet Passive Optical Networks (EPONs)" and use proper markup for the removed word "also"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 56 SC 56.1.2 P 67 L 38 # 3743  
Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks

Comment Type TR Comment Status D EZ

"For P2MP coaxial topologies, EFM supports EPoC operating with a nominal bit rate of up to 10 Gb/s in the downstream direction and up to 10 Gb/s in the upstream direction." - based on available upstream channel allocation, I am not sure how 10 Gb/s operation could be even theoretically achieved

*SuggestedRemedy*

Drill down the upstream data rates from 10 Gb/s to something that is more appropriate given the number of available upstream OFDM channels

Similar modification will be needed on page 68, line 53

Note that Table 56-1, Table 67-1, and even 100.1 list upstream speed as "up to 1.6 Gb/s"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Page 67, Line 39, change "10 Gb/s" to "1.6 Gb/s". Same for Page 68, Line 53.

Otherwise, cable operator configuration is based on local deployment conditions and drilling down is not possible.

CI 56 SC 56.1.2.1 P 67 L 54 # 3862  
Anslow, Pete Ciena

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

"as shown in Figure 56-2, Figure 56-4, and Figure 56-4" should be "as shown in Figure 56-2, Figure 56-3, and Figure 56-4"

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change "Figure 56-4, and" to "Figure 56-3, and"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 56 SC 56.1.2.2 P 69 L 19 # 3704  
Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

Editorial markup gone wrong in: "Clause 76, and the RS for EPoC P2MP topologies is described in Clause 101"

*SuggestedRemedy*

remove underline under "Clause 76" and add it under " Clause 101"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Align with comment #3988.

CI 56 SC 56.1.3 P 69 L 42 # 4061  
Zimmerman, George CME Consulting, Inc.

Comment Type ER Comment Status D EZ

Editing instruction is "change" - just show changed rows in Table 56-1 - most of them are unchanged, and it makes it hard to find the edit. Moreover, it looks like the change is to insert two rows, so the editing instruction should be "insert"

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change editing instruction to "Insert two rows at the end of Table 56-2, and add footnotes h & i following the existing footnotes"  
Only show the two rows for 10GPASS-XR-D and 10GPASS-XR-U, as well as the new footnotes.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Note: P. Anslow has been ok with this however, happy to change..<g>

CI 56 SC 56.1.3 P 71 L 13 # 3970  
 Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies

Comment Type T Comment Status D EZ

Is it really proper to refer to "One coaxial cable connected to a CCDN"? We do not refer to One single mode fiber connected to a PON for EPON.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change to "one CCDN"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 56 SC 56.1.3 P 71 L 28 # 3705  
 Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

missing space at the end of "These rates are based on maximum mandatory modulation format in Table 100-3"

*SuggestedRemedy*

Add missing space

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Missing a period, not a space.

CI 56 SC 56.1.3 P 71 L 30 # 4062  
 Zimmerman, George CME Consulting, Inc.

Comment Type ER Comment Status D EZ

Editing instruction "change" should be "insert"

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change editing instruction to "Insert four new columns to the right of the existing columns, and 2 new rows at the end of Table 56-3 (unchanged rows not shown)

Delete unchanged rows from the table.

Show the new rows without underline. (coordinate with IEEE staff whether new column headers should be underlined - that's above my pay grade...)

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

As noted with exception of adding only one row at the end, following "10GBASE-PR-U4".

NOTE: the column headers should be cross references to the appropriate clauses.

CI 56 SC Table 56-3 P 72 L 40 # 3895  
 Lusted, Kent Intel

Comment Type ER Comment Status D EZ

The entry for 10GPASS-XR is not consistent with the other entries in the table, which have a -U or a -D appendix on the nomenclature.

Listing both -U and -D would also then match the terms used in Table 56-11.

*SuggestedRemedy*

list 10GBASE-XR as 2 entries: one for the 10GPASS-XR-U and one for 10GPASS-XR-D.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

As suggested, coordinate with the changes as per comment #4062.

CI 67 SC 67.2 P 73 L 43 # 4077  
 Rahman, Saifur Comcast Cable

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

Following implies there are example(s) of EPoC topologies in the subclause but was unable to find figure for EPoC.

This subclause also shows some examples of different P2MP PON and EPoC topologies.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Add figure and reference or if figure exists reference to it.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

No figure was supplied by the commenter. (We deleted this figure in prior comments rounds and removed text, but missed removing this sentence.) Delete the sentence: "This subclause also shows some examples of different P2MP PON and EPoC topologies."

Cl 67 SC 67.6.1 P 74 L 21 # 3919  
Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies

Comment Type TR Comment Status D EZ

The paragraph wording does not match the wording in P802.3bx (shown below for D3.2) which may be different from the 2012 STD  
"This ability should be used only when the OAM sublayer is present and enabled or for a 1000BASE-PX-D, 10/1GBASE-PRX, or 10GBASE-PR PHY. Otherwise, MAC Client frames will be sent across a unidirectional link potentially causing havoc with bridge and other higher layer protocols. The feature should not be enabled for 1000BASE-PX-U, 10/1GBASE-PRX-U, or 10GBASE-PR-U PHYs in service, to avoid simultaneous transmission by more than one ONU."

SuggestedRemedy

Align wording to that in 802.3bx as  
"This ability should be used only when the OAM sublayer is present and enabled or for an OLT or CLT PHY. Otherwise, MAC Client frames will be sent across a unidirectional link potentially causing havoc with bridge and other higher layer protocols. The feature should not be enabled for ONU or CNU PHYs in service, to avoid simultaneous transmission by more than one ONU or CNU."

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 67 SC 67.6.1 P 74 L 24 # 3731  
Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks

Comment Type T Comment Status D EZ

"10GPASS-XR PHYs in service" - I believe you do not want to enable unidirectional mode on CNU only

SuggestedRemedy

Modify the text to "10GPASS-XR-U PHYs in service"

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 99 SC P 10 L 29 # 4068  
Regev, Alon Ixia

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

"802.3xx" should be "802.3bn"

SuggestedRemedy

change "802.3xx" to "802.3bn"

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 99 SC P 25 L 16 # 3860  
Anslow, Pete Ciena

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

The spelling of "Implementors" has been changed to "Implementers" in the latest IEEE style guide (and the latest 802.3 template)

SuggestedRemedy

Change ""Implementors" to "Implementers""

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 99 SC P 3 L 4 # 4069  
Regev, Alon Ixia

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

EPoC should not be hyphenated at "EP-oC".

Hyphenation should be done between syllables (so if it were otherwise valid, EPoC would be split as E-PoC), and should not be hyphenated such that you end up with only 1 letter at either the beginning or end of a line (so E-PoC) would not be valid.

Also, EPoC is a proper noun, so it should not be hyphenated.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "EP-oC" to "EPoC" (not hyphenated).

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
(Esc n s)

Cl 99 SC P 8 L 13 # 4066  
Regev, Alon Ixia

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

On lines 13 & 14, "IEEE P802.3xx Task Force name" should be replaced by "IEEE P802.3bn EPON Protocol over Coax Task Force"

SuggestedRemedy

On lines 13 & 14, change  
"IEEE P802.3xx Task Force name"  
to  
"IEEE P802.3bn EPON Protocol over Coax Task Force"

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT.



---

Cl **99** SC P **8** L **4** # **4067**  
 Regev, Alon Ixia  
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **D** EZ  
 "802.3xx" should be "802.3bn"  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 change "802.3xx" to "802.3bn"  
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

---

Cl **99** SC **99** P **8** L **4** # **4155**  
 Dawe, Piers Mellanox  
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **D** EZ  
 P802.3xx  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 P802.3bn, three times on this page. Several other instances of 802.3xx should be changed too.  
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

---

Cl **99** SC **FM** P **8** L **14** # **4172**  
 Law, David HP  
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **D** EZ  
 Now that the IEEE P802.3bn balloting group has been established, please complete the list of officers and members of the IEEE 802.3 working group.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Please include the list of officers and members of the IEEE 802.3 working group.  
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
 Editor changed Clause from "FM" to 99