

Cl 1 SC 1.4.244a P23 L18 # D20459
 Thompson, Geoff GraCaSI S.A./Independent
Comment Type ER Comment Status R
 I believe that this is the first use of the term "envelope" in this context. Please refer to it as a "timing envelope" to distinguish it from an envelope frame.
SuggestedRemedy
 Change the following text: "In the Multi-Channel Reconciliation Sublayer (MCRS, see Clause 143), an envelope encapsulates data belonging to a specific LLID being transmitted on a specific MCRS channel," TO READ: "In the Multi-Channel Reconciliation Sublayer (MCRS, see Clause 143), a timing envelope encompasses data belonging to a specific LLID being transmitted on a specific MCRS channel,"
Response Response Status U
 REJECT.
 When selecting the term "envelope", the TF has reviewed the base document to ensure there was no conflict of terms. In the existing body of IEEE Std 802.3, the word "envelope" mostly used in two contexts:
 1) "envelope frame(s)" - always used as this combination of words
 2) Envelope of a signal - always clear from the PMD focus of a given clause.
 The TF felt that using the word "envelope" by itself in EPON-related clauses will not be confusing to readers. However, the term "timing envelope" may be confusing because the term "envelope" is not related to time, but rather it is related to a number of bits/octets being transmitted or received.

Cl 1 SC 1.4.244b P23 L22 # D20460
 Thompson, Geoff GraCaSI S.A./Independent
Comment Type ER Comment Status R
 Per the previous comment, the general term "envelope" is already used elsewhere in 802.3. This will be a cause for confusion.
SuggestedRemedy
 Please refer to the PON use at this level as a "timing envelope" to distinguish it from other uses of the term envelope. The change is needed here and many places elsewhere throughout your draft. Please do a global search and examine each use of the term "envelope" for possible modification.
Response Response Status U
 REJECT.
 There are no other "envelopes" used in the standard today, so there is no confusion with other terms. The term itself is defined as a term (1.4.244a) and used consistently throughout the draft.
 See comment #459.

Cl 56 SC 56.1.2 P46 L38 # D20378
 Dawe, Piers Mellanox
Comment Type TR Comment Status R
 This PHY sensibly keeps the 25.78125 GBd line rate but uses stronger FEC with 20% (Fig 142-5) or $1-1/0.848 = 17.9\%$ (142.2.4.2) overhead. Even after reclaiming about 3% by 257b recoding, that's around 21.4 Gb/s MAC rate, which is too far from 25 to say "nominal MAC data rate of 25 Gb/s".
SuggestedRemedy
 Giving the PHY types names with 25G in them is fair, because that represents the technology used - but this part of the draft text is misleading.
 In this paragraph, change "25 Gb/s" to "21.4 Gb/s" and "50 Gb/2" to "42.8 Gb/s".
Response Response Status U
 REJECT.
 The nominal (how quickly MAC transmits bits, i.e., what the resulting bit time is) MAC rate is correct in here, the effective MAC rate (how many bits it can effectively transmit within a second) is lower and affected by FEC overhead, just like any other PHY that uses FEC and PCS encoding. MAC does not always transmit data, but when it does, it transmits it at 25Gb/s

Cl 56 SC 56.1.3 P51 L6 # D20427
 Dawe, Piers Mellanox
Comment Type ER Comment Status R
 The standard clause order is down the layer stack: MAC then RS then PCS then PMA then PMD. We are stuck with the eccentric order of some previous projects but we can do a new one right.
SuggestedRemedy
 Renumber the clauses 141-144: MPMC then MCRS then PCS/PMA then PMD.
 We can also order the existing columns in Table 56-3 from top to bottom - they don't have to be in numerical order
Response Response Status U
 REJECT.
 The clause order follows the clause order used by P2MP projects before.

Approved Responses

IEEE P802.3ca D2.0 25/50G-EPON Task Force Initial Working Group ballot comments

Cl 141 SC 141.5.1 P66 L27 # D20416
 Dawe, Piers Mellanox
 Comment Type TR Comment Status R
 An extinction ratio minimum of 8 dB sounds like an unhelpful constraint, which may force implementers to set up at worse TDP than they could have done.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Relax the extinction ratio minimum, add another OMA-TDP class at line 24 as necessary. This will cost the receiver nothing and widen the implementation options for the transmitter. Adjust note b from "at minimum extinction ratio" to "at 8 dB extinction ratio".
 Response Response Status U
 REJECT.
 All PMD parameter calculations have been done around ER (min) of 8dB and any changes to ER value would cause ripple effects for all receive side specs. A complete proposal for Tx and Rx specifications for lower ER (min) value would be needed. To date experimental data shows ER (min) of 8dB not presenting any issues.

Cl 141 SC 141.5.1 P66 L34 # D20417
 Dawe, Piers Mellanox
 Comment Type TR Comment Status A
 10GBASE-SR: BER 1e-12, TDP max 3.9, mask {0.25, 0.40, 0.45, 0.25, 0.28, 0.40} ("no hits") or {0.235, 0.395, 0.45, 0.235, 0.265, 0.4} at 5e10-5 hits/sample
 40GBASE-SR4: BER 1e-12, TDP max 3.5, mask {0.23, 0.34, 0.43, 0.27, 0.35, 0.4} at 5e10-5 hits/ sample
 25GBASE-SR: BER 5e10-5, TDEC max 4.3 dB, mask {0.3, 0.38, 0.45, 0.35, 0.41, 0.5} at 1.5e-3 hits/sample. KR FEC
 25GBASE-LR, ER: BER 5e10-5, TDP max 2.7 dB, {0.31, 0.4, 0.45, 0.34, 0.38, 0.4} at 5e-5 hits/sample. KR FEC
 This draft OLT: BER 1e-2, TDP max 1.5 dB, {0.25, 0.4, 0.45, 0.25, 0.28, 0.4} at 5e-5 hits/sample. QC-LDPC FEC
 ONU BER 1e-2, TDP max 2 dB, mask coordinates as 25GBASE-LR, ER. QC-LDPC FEC
 SuggestedRemedy
 So we need a new mask hit ratio, somewhere near 1e-2, and should review the mask coordinates when that is known.
 Response Response Status U
 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Insert an editor's note indicating that the new mask will be needed and submitted as a comment against the next draft(s).

Cl 141 SC 141.5.2 P68 L32 # D20418
 Dawe, Piers Mellanox
 Comment Type TR Comment Status R
 If these PMDs use FEC, probably the stressed receive signal should be defined by SEC, J2 and J4, as 25GBASE-SR, LR and ER, rather than VECF, J2 and J9 as 40GBASE-SR4.
 SuggestedRemedy
 But as the pre-BER is 1e-2, even J4 is wrong. Maybe Jrms and J3 would be suitable. SEC can easily be defined for a BER of 1e-2.
 Response Response Status U
 REJECT.
 Per http://www.ieee802.org/3/cc/public/adhoc/160907/tamura_3cc_adhoc_01.pdf, the current .3ca method of SRS measurement based on 100GBASE-LR/ER SRS is more conservative than SRS for a single wavelength of 100GBASE-SR4/LR/ER. There is no need to rework the specification at this time.
 See http://www.ieee802.org/3/ca/public/meeting_archive/2019/07/powell_3ca_2a_0719.pdf for detailed discussion.

Cl 141 SC 141.7.13.2 P78 L1 # D2098
 Anslow, Pete Ciena
 Comment Type ER Comment Status A redraw
 Some of the figures in the draft are appropriately drawn. However, a number of the figures are inserted as bit maps.
 This has several drawbacks: the rendition of the figures is poor making small text difficult to read, the use of bit maps increases the file size unnecessarily, the text content of the figures is not searchable and most importantly, including non-editable figures makes life difficult if changes are required in Maintenance after the figure has been incorporated into the next revision.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Go through the entire draft replacing figures that have been pasted as bit maps with versions that are drawn in FrameMaker.
 If there are any figures illustrating equations, use a vector graphics (e.g. .svg format) and apply any text annotations in FrameMaker.
 Example figures needing to be replaced are Figures 141-3, 142-2, 142-5, 142-6, 142-7, 142-8, 142-9, 142-13, 142-14, 142-15, 142-16, 142-18, 143-1, 143-2, 143-3, 143-4, 143-5, 143-6, 143-7, 143-8, 143-9, 143-12, 143-13, 143-15, 143-16, 144-3, 144-4, 144-5, 144-6, 144-7, 144-8, 144-9, 144-10, 144-11, 144-12, 144-13, 144-13, 144-14, 144-15, 144-16, 144-17, 144-18, 144-20, 144-21, 144-22, 144-23, 144-24, 144-25, 144-26, 144-27, 144-28, 144-29, 144-31, 144-32, 144-33, 144-34, 142A-1
 Response Response Status W
 ACCEPT.

Approved Responses

IEEE P802.3ca D2.0 25/50G-EPON Task Force Initial Working Group ballot comments

Cl 142 SC 142.2.4.2 P116 L5 # D20379

Dawe, Piers Mellanox
 Comment Type TR Comment Status A

I don't know what you mean by pi-1info. Similar problem at line 9.

SuggestedRemedy

Explain, or better, use more familiar notation

Response Response Status U

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

append the following sentence to the end of the paragraph on Page 116, Lines 3-5 : "pi(-1)_{info} represents the de-interleaver mapping of information bits that permutes u* to u". and also append the following sentence to the end of the paragraph on Page 116, Lines 6-8: "pi_{parity} represents the interleaver mapping of parity bits that permutes p' to p*."

Cl 142 SC 142.2.4.3 P116 L25 # D20382

Dawe, Piers Mellanox
 Comment Type TR Comment Status A

I don't know what you mean by "Omega networks".

SuggestedRemedy

Define what you are talking about. If it doesn't matter, don't mention them.

Response Response Status U

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Add an informative reference to

Lawrie, Duncan H. (December 1975). "Access and Alignment of Data in an Array Processor". IEEE Transactions on Computers. C-24 (12): 1145–55.
<https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/stamp/stamp.jsp?tp=&arnumber=1672750>

at the first instance of Omega network used as a term

Cl 142 SC 142.3.5.4 P135 L15 # D20485

Slavick, Jeff Broadcom
 Comment Type TR Comment Status R

In Figure 141-15 the exit from GET_NEXT_BLOCK has a conflict in exit criteria. If SignalFail and MatchFound are both true which path do you take?

SuggestedRemedy

Change the path to CHECK_CW_LEN to be "!SignalFail AND Matchfound..."

Response Response Status U

REJECT.

It is unnecessary to complicate this transition in the SD, since regardless of which of the two transitions the SD takes, it will end up in the same state.

Cl 142 SC 142.4 P137 L53 # D20385

Dawe, Piers Mellanox
 Comment Type TR Comment Status A PMA
 Missing text

SuggestedRemedy

Introduce / summarise the PMA

Response Response Status U

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #386.

