

Cl 45 SC 45.2.1.4.b P 29 L 20 # 4184  
Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks

Comment Type E Comment Status D ez

>>Insert 45.2.1.4.b before 45.2.1.4.a (as inserted by IEEE Std 802.3by-201x) as follows:"<< - extra " at the end of editorial instructions

*SuggestedRemedy*

Remove extra "  
Similar change on page 29, line 25

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 45 SC 45.2.1.6 P 30 L 14 # 4185  
Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks

Comment Type E Comment Status D ez

No RO in Table 45-7

*SuggestedRemedy*

No need to include in the draft amendment

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.  
You only see part of the table, see Section 4 of Std

Cl 45 SC 45.2.1.141.1 P 40 L 4 # 4186  
Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks

Comment Type E Comment Status D ez

"When set to zero the associated CNU\_ID has not been assigned." - when what is set to zero?

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change "When set to zero the associated CNU\_ID has not been assigned." to "When bit 1.1915.15 is set to zero the associated CNU\_ID has not been assigned."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
use "When this bits is set to zero ..."

Cl 45 SC 45.2.1.147 P 42 L 37 # 4188  
Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks

Comment Type E Comment Status D ez formatted

"UQ34.3 formatted number" - I believe it is "formatted" and not "formatted"

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change all instances of "formatted" to "formated"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 45 SC 45.2.1.149 P 43 L 45 # 4189  
Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks

Comment Type E Comment Status D ez

"NMW = Multi-word" - only MW is used in the table

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change "NMW" to "MW" - scrub the rest of the draft

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
only one instance in draft

Cl 45 SC 45.2.1.162.1 P 48 L 28 # 4190  
Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks

Comment Type E Comment Status D ez

"Bits 1.1949.15:0 through 1950.7:0 form a 24 bit value" - I believe "24 bit" is used as an edjective and should be hyphenated

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change "24 bit" to "24-bit". Also, scrub the rest of the draft for similar use cases and insert hyphens as needed

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
fix this instance and any others noticed

CI 45 SC 45.2.1.163.2 P 49 L 10 # 4191  
Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks

Comment Type E Comment Status D ez

"Response in units of 0.25 dBmV/1.6MHz." - missing space between numeric value and units in "1.6MHz"

*SuggestedRemedy*

Insert the missing space. Make sure all values in the draf have a following space before unit. There are multiple instances in the draft (quick search shows at least 10 hits for problems with MHz)

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
See comment 4303

CI 100 SC 100.2.1.3 P 76 L 33 # 4197  
Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks

Comment Type TR Comment Status D EZ

Heading "100.2.1.3 PMD\_UNITDATA.indication" indicates that PMD\_UNITDATA.indication primitive is to be described, yet the text speaks of PMD\_SIGNAL.request primitive. Which is it? It seems (based on CMP version) that in D2.0 the text was correct, but it was modified incorrectly in D2.0

*SuggestedRemedy*

Please revert text from D2.0 - it was correct. Current text is NOT. Current text seems to be repetition of text from 100.2.1.4 PMD\_SIGNAL.request

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
Draft 2.1: Page 76, paragraph from lines 32 to 35. Replace entire paragraph with the paragraph from Draft 2.0, Page 86, Lines 36 through 38.

CI 100 SC 100.2.6.3 P 80 L 8 # 4198  
Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

"This variable is set to TRUE if the CNU calculation of DS\_DataRate differs from the DS\_DataRate calculation communicated from the CLT by more than 10 b/s otherwise the variable is set to FALSE" - it seems that there should be "," or ";" before the word "otherwise" to separate two independent portions of the sentence

*SuggestedRemedy*

Insert ";" in indicated location in the description of DS\_RateMatchFail and US\_RateMatchFail variables

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 100 SC 100.2.7 P 80 L 19 # 4199  
Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks

Comment Type T Comment Status D EZ

"Equipment conforming to this standard shall clearly mark ." - equipment is typically labelled, not marked

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change "Equipment conforming to this standard shall clearly mark" to "Equipment conforming to this standard shall be clearly labelled with information about the"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 100 SC 100.2.9.3 P 90 L 21 # 4201  
Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

The CLT can only ensure it once: "The CLT ensures ensure the following"

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change to "The CLT ensures the following"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 101 SC 101.1.4 P 122 L 34 # 4208  
Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks

Comment Type TR Comment Status D ez

Looking at Figure 101-1, 4 out of 5 instances of CPW are marked as "CPW5" - I believe the numbers on individual CPW instances should match numbers on IDFT i.e., 2, 3, 4, and 5. The same observation applies to INTERLEAVING & PILOT INSERTION blocks, 4 out of 5 of which are also labelled as "5".

*SuggestedRemedy*

Fix numbers for CPW and INTERLEAVING & PILOT INSERTION blocks  
Similar numbering problems exist in Figure 101-3 for FFT and DE-INTERLEAVING blocks

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 101 SC 101.1.4 P 125 L 45 # 4209  
Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks

Comment Type E Comment Status D ez

Extra "\" character in "\FFT = FAST FOURIER TRANSFORM"

*SuggestedRemedy*

remove the extra "\"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 101 SC 101.3.2.1.3 P 130 L 6 # 4211  
Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks

Comment Type E Comment Status D ez

Inconsistent formatting for "DS\_PHY\_OSize" variable. I suspect it was intended to be all in italics.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Per comment

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 101 SC 101.3.2.5.6 P 141 L 39 # 4213  
Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks

Comment Type E Comment Status D ez

Is there any specific reason to use curly brackets with ceil function in this location:  $\lceil (1800+40)/65 \rceil$ .

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change to  $\lceil (1800+40)/65 \rceil$

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 101 SC 101.3.2.5.7 P 142 L 50 # 4214  
Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks

Comment Type E Comment Status D ez

Missing "=" symbol in "bits<1:32> the current PHY Link timestamp" - for consistency with the surrounding text

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change "bits<1:32> the current PHY Link timestamp" to "bits<1:32> = the current PHY Link timestamp"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 101 SC 101.3.2.5.7 P 144 L 47 # 4216  
Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks

Comment Type T Comment Status D ez

"ARRAY\_IN[]" to the PMA using" - since you do not expect ARRAY\_IN to be empty, it should be referenced by name without empty []

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change "ARRAY\_IN[]" to the PMA using" to "ARRAY\_IN to the PMA using"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 101 SC 101.3.2.5.7 P 145 L 16 # 4217  
Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks

Comment Type E Comment Status D ez

Incorrect format for NOTE: "Note: in the CLT the lastcodeword argument to this function is always TRUE (see Figure 101-12)." - please apply a correct style

*SuggestedRemedy*

Per comment  
Also, three locations in 101.4.2.1.2

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

The text is using Paragraph Tag "Note" as are the two notes in 101.4.2.1.2 ( the editor cannot find a third note in 101.4.2.1.2). This is consistent with the WG template.

CI 101 SC 101.3.3.1.6 P 153 L 30 # 4219  
Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks

Comment Type E Comment Status D ez

Missing "is" in "This variable used for counting bits in the Transfer from PMA process."

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change to "This variable is used for counting bits in the Transfer from PMA process."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 101 SC 101.4.3.4.5 P 165 L 44 # 4223  
Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks

Comment Type E Comment Status D ez

We do avoid the use of "will" apart from some very specific cases - this is not it: "the PHY will treat the subcarrier as null"

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change "the PHY will treat the subcarrier as null" to "the PHY treats the subcarrier as null"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 101 SC 101.4.3.1.3 P 188 L 46 # 4227  
Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks

Comment Type E Comment Status D ez

Missing full stop after "downstream Frequency Band as per Table 100-3" in Table 101-12

*SuggestedRemedy*

Add missing "."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 101 SC 101.4.5.2 P 214 L 5 # 4232  
Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks

Comment Type E Comment Status D ez, Black Sq

Figure 101-40, Figure 101-41, Figure 101-42, and others have black squares, which I believe were intended to be dots.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Please redraw in Frame to make squares look like proper dots

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See remain\_3bn\_10\_1115 and Comments #4276 and #4311.

CI 103 SC 103.2.2.1 P 297 L 11 # 4246  
Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks

Comment Type E Comment Status D ez

Incorrect multiplication symbol in DS\_FEC\_CW\_Sz\_FRAC□

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change "\*" to proper "x" multiplication symbol

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

(Ctrl Q 0)

CI 103 SC 103.2.2.1 P 297 L 50 # 4249  
 Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D ez  
 Type "TYPE:Unsigned integer" should be "TYPE: unsigned integer"  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Per comment  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 103 SC 103.2.2.7 P 303 L 1 # 4251  
 Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D ez  
 Different fonts (Times and Arial) in the same SD  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Compare states ADVANCE\_BY\_1 and START\_DERATING\_TIMER - I understand that either is allowed, but let's not mix them on the same SD. They just look odd.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Use Arial

CI 103 SC 103.3.3.1 P 311 L 26 # 4252  
 Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D ez  
 "8 bit" in "8 bit unsigned integer" is an adjective and should be hyphenated  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change "8 bit unsigned integer" to "8-bit unsigned integer" globally  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 103 SC 103.3.5.1 P 320 L 41 # 4255  
 Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D ez  
 "VALUE: 0x03B9ACA0 (1 s)" - division of a value into 8 bit groups with - helps with readability  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Consider changing larger hex values to 0xaa-bb-cc-dd format.  
 Here, change "VALUE: 0x03B9ACA0 (1 s)" to "VALUE: 0x03-B9-AC-A0 (1 s)"  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Here and also pg 252 line 11 and pg 321 line 37

CI 45 SC 45.2.1.4 P 29 L 20 # 4261  
 Marris, Arthur Cadence Design Syste  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D ez  
 45.2.1.4.b should be inserted after 45.2.1.4.a  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Make editing instruction on line 20:  
 "Insert 45.2.1.4.b after 45.2.1.4.a (as inserted by IEEE Std 802.3by-201x) as follows:"  
 Delete the "Reserved for future speeds" row from Table 45-6 so only the "10GPASS-XR capable" row remains.  
 Make editing instruction on line 3:  
 "Insert a new row in Table 45-6 below the row for 1.4.11 as inserted by IEEE Std 802.3by-201x as follows (unchanged rows not shown):"  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 100A SC 100A.2 P 340 L 9 # 4265  
Laubach, Mark Broadcom

Comment Type ER Comment Status D EZ

Fix case and TLA problems in table notes for Table 100A-1.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Line 9, NOTE 4: lower case "Frequency"  
Line 12, NOTE 7: lower case words "Reference, Live Video" and "Interference"  
Line 14, NOTE 8: lower case words "Worst Case Frequency; Good" and "Analog", expand "PAR" to "peak-to-average ratio (PAR)"  
Line 17 and 18, NOTE 10: lower case "Bandwidth" and "Levels"  
Line 18, NOTE 10: "ReDesign" comes up in searching for "ReDesign channel model" on the web suggesting this is referencing something. AIP this comment to add an appropriate reference and/or change. (Have to check with experts to find what this means.)  
Line 20, NOTE 11: lower case "Clipping"  
Line 21, NOTE 12: lower case "Minimum"  
Line 22, NOTE 13: lower case "Single Dominant" and "Does"  
Line 23, NOTE 14: lower case "Definition, Echo"  
Line 24, NOTE 15: lower case "Basis"

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 100A SC 100A.3 P 342 L 10 # 4266  
Laubach, Mark Broadcom

Comment Type ER Comment Status D EZ

Fix case and TLA problems in table notes for Table 100A-2.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Line 10, NOTE 1: lower case "Loss"  
Line 12, NOTE 3: change "DS" to "downstream"  
Line 14, NOTE 4: lower case "Report"  
Line 17, NOTE 6: lower case "Upstream"  
Line 18, NOTE 7: lower case "Single Dominant"  
Line 19, NOTE 8: lower case "Definition, Echo"

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 100A SC 100A.1 P 351 L 11 # 4268  
Laubach, Mark Broadcom

Comment Type T Comment Status D EZ

Strengthen the relationship of the topology to the baseline channel conditions.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change: "The normative EPoC OFDM channel parameters are based on the topology shown in Figure 100A-1" to  
"The normative EPoC baseline channel conditions and OFDM channel parameters are referenced to the topology shown in Figure 100A-1"

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 100 SC 100.3.3 P 118 L 28 # 4269  
Laubach, Mark Broadcom

Comment Type T Comment Status D EZ

Reword as only one upstream OFDMA channel

*SuggestedRemedy*

Delete "in a specified OFDMA channel "

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
Mistype, comment is regarding Page 108, Line 42. Otherwise, as per comment.

CI 30 SC 30.3.5.1.2 P 1 L 1 # 4270  
Laubach, Mark Broadcom

Comment Type ER Comment Status D EZ

Add cross references for Clause 103 to two places in Clause 30.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Insert editing directives to IEEE editor(s) for "30.3.5.1.2 aMPCPAdminState" AND "30.3.5.1.3 aMPCPMode" to add Clause 103 to cross references: i.e. change "in Clause 64 or Clause 77" to "in Clause 64, Clause 77, or Clause 103".

Proposed Response Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 00 SC 100.3.4 P 110 L 29 # 4272  
 Laubach, Mark Broadcom  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ  
 First uses of "OFDM Symbol Clock" in Clause 100 and 101 needs a cross reference to 101.4.3.2.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Page 110, Line 29: Add the cross reference "(see 100.3.4)" after "OFDM Symbol Clock"  
 Page 161, Line 47, do the same.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 102 SC 102.2.3.1.4 P 247 L 18 # 4274  
 Remein, Duane Huawei Technologies  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D ez  
 Supurfelous period in figure title  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 removed.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 01 SC 1.4.144a P 20 L 26 # 4297  
 Anslow, Pete Ciena  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D ez  
 "comprising of" is poor english.  
 Same issue in 1.4.294b  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change "comprising of" to "composed of" here and also in 1.4.294b  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 01 SC 1.4.294b P 21 L 1 # 4298  
 Anslow, Pete Ciena  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D ez  
 "A optical" should be "An optical"  
 "fiber optical" does not occur in 802.3 whereas "fiber optic" occurs 438 times  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change "A optical" to "An optical"  
 Change "fiber optical" to "fiber optic"  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 30 SC 30.3.2.1.2 P 23 L 15 # 4300  
 Anslow, Pete Ciena  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ  
 "Clause 101" should be a cross-reference here and on line 27  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Make "Clause 101" a cross-reference here and on line 27  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 45 SC 45.2.1.4.b P 29 L 19 # 4301  
 Anslow, Pete Ciena  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D ez  
 "Insert 45.2.1.4.b before 45.2.1.4.a" should be "Insert 45.2.1.4.b after 45.2.1.4.a"  
 Also, there is a spurious " at the end of the editing instruction and also at the end of the subclause text.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change "Insert 45.2.1.4.b before 45.2.1.4.a" to "Insert 45.2.1.4.b after 45.2.1.4.a"  
 Delete the two spurious instances of "  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 45 SC 45.2.1.14a P 30 L 19 # 4302  
 Anslow, Pete Ciena

Comment Type E Comment Status D ez

The P802.3bw draft (which has completed sponsor ballot) has inserted 45.2.1.14a for register 1.18. As register 1.17 is before this, 45.2.1.14a should be 45.2.1.14aa.  
 Same issue for Table 45-17a which has to be Table 45-17aa

*SuggestedRemedy*

Renumber 45.2.1.14a to be 45.2.1.14aa and Table 45-17a to be Table 45-17aa

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 45 SC 45.2.1.163.2 P 49 L 10 # 4303  
 Anslow, Pete Ciena

Comment Type E Comment Status D ez

"0.25 dBmV/1.6MHz"  
 There should always be a (non-breaking) space between a number and its unit.  
 Also, the draft is inconsistent as to whether there are spaces either side of the /

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change this instance from "0.25 dBmV/1.6MHz" to "0.25 dBmV / 1.6 MHz" using non-breaking spaces (Ctrl space) for all four spaces to ensure that it does not break across two lines.  
 Go through the rest of the draft to make all other instances of similar text consistent.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
 See comment 4191

CI 100 SC 100.2.12 P 103 L 9 # 4304  
 Dawe, Piers Mellanox

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

100.2.11 CLT upstream receive modulation error ratio requirements follows 100.2.10 CLT receiver requirements while 100.2.12.3 Receive modulation error ratio requirements comes under 100.2.12 CNU receiver requirements.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Put 100.2.11 under 100.2.10.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 100 SC 100.2 P 106 L 1 # 4310  
 Carlson, Steve High Speed Design, Inc.

Comment Type E Comment Status D EZ

Figure 100-4 has some odd shading going on in the squares and circles.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Redraw figure to remove shading. It looks like the drawing might be non-Frame; if so suggest redrawing it in Frame.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Redraw the figure in Frame, remove shading.

CI 101 SC 101.4 P 214 L 11 # 4311  
 Carlson, Steve High Speed Design, Inc.

Comment Type E Comment Status D ez, Black Sq

Figure 101-40—BPSK has black squares—are these supposed to be dots? Same for 101-41, 101-42, 101-43.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Suggest redrawing the figure in Frame to get the correct dots.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 See remain\_3bn\_10\_1115 and comments #4232 and #4276

CI 45 SC 45.2. P 43 L 13 # 4313  
 Carlson, Steve High Speed Design, Inc.

Comment Type E Comment Status D ez, formatted

In Table 45-98r— and Table 43-98q "formatted" is incorrect.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change "formatted" to "formatted" in both tables.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.



---

Cl 100 SC 100.2 P 93 L 34 # 4314  
Carlson, Steve High Speed Design, Inc.

Comment Type ER Comment Status D EZ

Line 30 uses log (sub)10, yet line 42 uses log10. Are these supposed to be the same?

*Suggested Remedy*

Please clarify if line 42 is intended to be log (sub) 10.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Line 42 contains no math. Assumption is comparison of line 30 and line 34. On checking the DOCSIS PHY D3.1 spec, the "10" in "log10" should be subscript.

Change:

Line 30, insert a times symbol between the "10" and the "log10" as similar in Line 34.

Line 34, subscript the "10" in "log10".