Cl **1** *SC* **1.4.331** *P* **29** *L* **16** # i-7

Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Network

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **R** *ML/GK*

Strike statement: "Frames transit the network between the central station and the end stations and do not transit directly from end station to end station." - we do not restrict ONU/CNU to ONU/CNU communication, if one desired to deploy links between them - these are outside of the scope of our definitions.

SuggestedRemedy

per comment

Response *Response Status* **U**

REJECT.
ONU/CNU to ONU/CNU communication is not supported any P2MP PHY and such communication is done through a bridge above 802.3.

Cl **45** *SC* **45.2.1.131** *P* **39** *L* **1** # i-10

Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Network

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **A** *+REV+ DR Sed Cl45 renum*

Registers 45.2.1.133 through 45.2.1.137 are already allocated by P802.3bw, which will likely be published before .3bn

SuggestedRemedy

move registers 45.2.1.131 - 165 to 45.2.1.138 - 172 and renumber accordingly
Renumber also Tables to make sure there is no conflict with projects in Sponsor Ballot or approved.

Response *Response Status* **U**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
REVISED
Coordinate with other clause 45 editors and change clause numbering as agreed, register numbering remains as is. Tables will be renumbered per comment i-371 (resolution copied below)
Editors to consult with WG Secretary and IEEE staff editors for preferred resolution.

Cl **45** *SC* **45.2.7a.4** *P* **64** *L* **18** # i-14

Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Network

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **R** *+REV+*

Table 45-98q and Table 45-98r specify order of mapping of fixed and fractional elements of a floating point number. Why is the same not done in Table 45-211e and other table defining pre-equalizer coefficients? Is the mapping intended to start with fixed or fractional part?

SuggestedRemedy

Consider adding details from Table 45-98q/r to make sure that it is clear where fractional and fixed elements of the floating point numbers would be located

Response *Response Status* **U**

REJECT.
This 16-bit number wholly maps into a single MDIO register whereas the numbers in Table 45-98q/r require 3 registers with some spare register bits requiring enumeration of used and spare bits.

Cl **100A** *SC* **100A.2** *P* **352** *L* **4** # i-27

Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Network

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **R** *+REV+ Sed*

All notes under the table are NOT in the right format.

SuggestedRemedy

Apply proper FM style - right now these are simple T,Text style text.
Also, is the intent to use informative or normative notes here? There is a difference and it seems that you're after footnotes, and not notes to table. If that is the case, use footnotes, and not notes.
The same observation applies to Table 100A-2

Response *Response Status* **U**

REJECT.
These are Table Notes and informative (see 14.4 in the Style Manual). IEEE Staff Editors approved the current format and paragraph tag.

Cl **100** *SC* **100.3.4.6** *P* **97** *L* **25** # i-47

Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Network

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **R** *+REV+*

"The CLT shall provide for ... " - CLT as a system? This is the PMD clause

SuggestedRemedy

Consider rewriting it to a CLT PMD requirement, e.g., "The 10GPASS-XR-D PMD shall support ..."
Update PICS. There are multiple entries in Clause 100 where similar generic requirement is stated
There are also similar generic statements for a CNU, without indicating which layer is responsible for the function

Response *Response Status* **U**

REJECT.
The construct of "CLT shall" is consistent with usage in IEEE STD 802.3 2015 clauses 64 . 77 that use "OLT shall"

The commenter is invited to submit a maintence request if this remains a blocking issue.

Cl **100** *SC* **100.3.5.4.3** *P* **104** *L* **31** # i-61

Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Network

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **R**

Round function has been used before, but explained only here.

SuggestedRemedy

Suggest to move the definition to 100.1.1 (terminology and conventions) if it is used pervasively (so it seems now) in this clause

Response *Response Status* **U**

REJECT.
The Round() function is used only twice and explained imediately after each use.

Cl **100** *SC* **100.3.6.1** *P* **110** *L* **1** # i-76

Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Network

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **R** *+REV+ Sed*

Table title is incomplete: "Upstream OFDMA channel demodulator input power characteristics (con-"

SuggestedRemedy

Make sure it is complete, even when broken across line

Response *Response Status* **U**

REJECT.
This appears to be a Framemaker table continuation issue with the automatically appended "(continued)" text.
Staff editors say that standards are professionally edited by IEEE editors prior to publication.

Cl **100** *SC* **100.3.7.3** *P* **114** *L* **8** # i-87

Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Network

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **R** *+REV+*

Conflicting definitions
Page 114, line 8: "RxMER is defined as the ratio of the average power of the ideal QAM constellation to the average error-vector power"
Page 111, line 23: "RxMER is defined as the ratio of the average power of the ideal BPSK constellation to the average error-vector power"
Which is it then?

SuggestedRemedy

Rationalize - either it is one and the same (then which one is correct??) or expand the acronym to reflect that one is for QAM and another for BPSK constellation

Response *Response Status* **U**

REJECT.
One (pg 111) is for the CLT: "For the purposes of RxMER measurement at the CLT, ."
The other (pg 114) is for the CNU: "For the purposes of RxMER measurement at the CNU,.."
And yes these are different.

Cl **100** *SC* **100.6** *P* **120** *L* **42** # i-110

Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Network

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **R** *+REV+*

Untestable requirement: "For the 10GPASS-XR-U PHY the CNU shall enable Energy-Efficient Ethernet (EEE) capability to conserve energy by deactivating power-consuming PMD Functions (e.g. RF power amplifier) between bursts using PMD_SIGNAL.request (see 100.2.1.4)."

SuggestedRemedy

The very nature of EPoC (like EPON) implies that transmit path is disabled in between bursts.
Change the text to read: "In order to support EEE-like power saving, the 10GPASS-XR PHYs may deactivate some PHY functional blocks, e.g., RF power amplifier, between individual data bursts (in case of 10GPAS-XR-U PHY), disable some of OFDM channels (in case of 10GPAS-XR-D PHY) when traffic load is low, or use other vendor-specific mechanisms to lower the overal PHY consumption without affecting the latency and BER on the EPoC link." - this is as good as we can do here without specific hooks for EEE at the PHY layer

Response *Response Status* **U**

REJECT.
There is no support in this standard to "disable some of OFDM channels (in case of 10GPAS-XR-D PHY) when traffic load is low", "other vendor-specific mechanisms " are outside the scope of the standard.

Cl **101** *SC* **101.4.3.3** *P* **174** *L* **6** # i-181

Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Network

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **R** *+REV+*

Equation 101-8 is not the final form

SuggestedRemedy

Change to: "6.4 x DSNcp", which is simpler and avoids unnecessary multiplications and exponents

Response *Response Status* **U**

REJECT.
While this is true it would leave the reader with no hint as to how we arrived at this magic number of 6.4. It is informative to the reader to know how the formula was arrive at in this case; 128 and 50,000 should be well known to the reader at this point.

Cl **101** *SC* **101.4.3.9.2** *P* **187** *L* **21** # i-196

Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Network

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **R** *+REV+*

Clearly untestable: The CLT shall support values of DS_TmIntrlv from 1 to 32 (see 101.4.3.9.5).

SuggestedRemedy

Convert into statement. Update PICS

Response *Response Status* **U**

REJECT.
This is testable at the MDI connector using an NSA that looks at OFDM symbols.

Cl **102** *SC* **102** *P* **239** *L* **1** # i-243

Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Network

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **R** *+REV+*

All of the recent non-fiber based projects define their own Operations, Administration, and Maintenance (OAM) protocols, providing the function of what you call "PHY Link". Even GPOF does it in their own OAM specification. All of these OAMs are PHY specific, and are aptly called "1000BASE-T1 OAM", "1000BASE-H OAM", etc.

SuggestedRemedy

Rename "PHY Link" to "10GPASS-XR OAM", which is what this really is - it is an OAM link that allows for exchange of some data and provides for bidirectional low-level link between CLT and CNU
The proposed name does not conflict with Clause 57 OAM, and has been accepted by multiple projects consistently.

Response *Response Status* **U**

REJECT.
The term PHY Link is clear, unambigous and not technically incorrect. It appears in the draft 542 times. Changing now would be a massive change to resolve a personal preference and at this point in the process is ill advised and will likely introduce errors into the draft.

Cl **1** *SC* **1.4.144b** *P* **28** *L* **33** # i-285

Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associate

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **R** *+REV+ Sed*

the term is used in it's own definition. This is not allowed in an IEEE standard.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete second sentence

Response *Response Status* **U**

REJECT.
The definition is modeled directly after a similar definition for the OLT in the 2015 STD. We would like to maintain consistency with previous PON related definitions.
"1.4.302 Optical Line Terminal (OLT): The network-end DTE for an optical access network. The OLT is the master entity in a P2MP network with regard to the MPCP protocol."

If the commenter feels strongly about this issue they are invited to submit a maintence request.

Cl **1** *SC* **1.4.144c** *P* **28** *L* **37** # i-286

Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associate

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **R** *+REV+*

Term is used in the definition. This is not allowed in an IEEE Standard (see IEEE Standard Style Manual)

SuggestedRemedy

Delete everything after first period.

Response *Response Status* **U**

REJECT.
The definition is modeled directly after a similar definition for the ONU in the 2015 STD. We would like to maintain consistency with previous PON related definitions.
"1.4.304 Optical Network Unit (ONU): The subscriber-end DTE to an optical access network. An ONU is a slave entity in a P2MP network with regard to the MPCP protocol."

If the commenter feels strongly about this issue they are invited to submit a maintence request.

Cl **FM** *SC* **FM** *P* **13** *L* **13** # i-364

Grow, Robert RMG Consulting

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **A** *+REV+ Sed*

There are other approved or likely to be approved amendments to IEEE Std 802.3 that should be concurent or before P802.3bp approval.

SuggestedRemedy

P802.3bw is approved and designated Amendment 1, P802.32by has been designated Amendment 2, P802.3bq Amendment 3 and P802.3bp Amendment 4. br failed to meet conditions for RevCom submittal, by and bq also in Sponsor ballot. Either add an editor's note that other amendment descriptions will be added during publication preparation, or gather the amendment information (I think they are all in P802.3bv).

Response *Response Status* **U**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
REVISED
See comment i-6 (Response copied below)

Per comment except [2] (WG Chair has not yet announced the order of this amendment)

Cl **FM** *SC* **FM** *P* **27** *L* **44** # i-365

Grow, Robert RMG Consulting

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **A** *+REV+ Sed*

I expect the WG Chair will designate an amendment number for this project.

SuggestedRemedy

This note should be updated for the known preceding amendments (bw, by, bq, bp) and any others that the draft assumes to precede this in approval order.

Response *Response Status* **U**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
REVISED
Add the following after confirming with Working Group Secretary:
IEEE Std 802.3bw-2015
IIEEE Std 802.3by-20xx
IEEE Std 802.3bq-20xx
IEEE Std 802.3bp-20xx

See i-363 (response copied below)
Staff Editors would like to change all amendment references to "IEEE Std 802.3yy-20xx" where yy is the project designation and xx is the year completed. If a project is not completed when this draft is approved by SASB leave the "xx".

Cl **45** *SC* **45.2.1.17aa** *P* **38** *L* **17** # i-369

Grow, Robert RMG Consulting

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **A** *+REV+*

This editorial instruction is wrong. Clause 45 presents registers in assending number. The 2015 revision has 45.2.1.14 describing register 1.16. IEEE Std 802.3bw-2015 inserts 45.2.1.14a describing register 1.18. Register 1.17 belongs between these two register descriptions. (P802.3by inserts 45.2.1.14b and Table 45-17b descriging register 1.19). While the aa is arguably correct (what happens when we need to do the 27th insert and want to wrap to aa), the referenced document isn't correct.

SuggestedRemedy

I recommend using the letter c and giving up on the letter meaning anything about order. Correct instruction to read Insert 45.2.1.14c and Table 45-17c after 45.2.1.14 (before the 45.2.1.14a and Table 45-17a inserted by IEEE Std 802.3bw-2015) as follows:

Response *Response Status* **U**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
REVISED
See comment i-4 which changes "after" to "before" so correct order is maintaned.

Cl **45** *SC* **45.2.1.131** *P* **39** *L* **3** # i-371

Grow, Robert RMG Consulting

Comment Type **ER** *Comment Status* **A** *+REV+ Cl45 renum*

IEEE Std 802.3bw has inserted 45.2.1.131 and 45.2.1.132. Because these 802.3bw subclauses are defining registers 1.2101 and 1.2102, the inserts, if we continue to follow using letters, needs to be 45.2.1.130a through 45.2.1.130ak. (The instruction is also in error on the range of inserts as there is a 45.2.1.167 in the draft. This highlights the problem with aa being ambiguous as used on P.39, L.17.

SuggestedRemedy

Option 1 -- an option that I did not present to our publication editors would be to use our amendment number rather than trying to enforce an alphabetical ordered meaning. In that case, these would be 45.2.1.130bn1 through 45.2.1.130bn31. Pretty ugly. Option 2 -- 45.2.1.130a through 45.2.1.130ak. Option 3 -- Personally, I'd prefer not using letters but specify renumbering (but I seem to be in the minority of vocal participants). Doing that the instruction would be: Insert 45.2.1.131 through 45.2.1.167 and sub-clauses after 45.2.1.130 (before the inserts at the same place by IEEE Std 802.3bw), and renumber as required:.

Response *Response Status* **U**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
REVISED
Editors to consult with WG Secretary and IEEE staff editors for preferred resolution.