## Proposed Responses ical Specifications and Management Parameters for 25Gb/s and 50Gb/s Passive Optical Networks 3rd Ta

C/ 142 SC 142.2.2	2.4.2 P70	L11	# 596	C/ 142	SC 142.2.3.	2.4	P88	L1	# 593	
Laubach, Mark	Broadcom			Kramer, G	len		Broadcom			
Comment Type TR	Comment Status X		post-deadline	Comment	Туре Т	Comment	Status X		post-deadline	
Comment #131 on D "2) Change the box t Interleaver" to "Inforr De-interleaver"	1.0 had a portion of it not imple ext "Information Bit nation Bit	mented correctly	<i>r</i> .	The go onlt be make variab	eneric section of powers of 2 (i.e the MCRS state les rCol and wC	f the current Mo e, 1, 2, 4, 8, etc diagram simpl ol are defined (	CRS specificati c.). This is an u ler. MCRS is o (no explict rese	on allows the nu nnecessary res only specified thi t to 0, only on re	umber of channels to triction and it does not is way because of how oll-over)	
SuggestedRemedy				Suggested	lRemedy					
Please fix the figure	accordingly			1) Def	ine an generic c	onstant NUM_	CH to represen	it the number of	supported MCRS	
Proposed Response Response Status O				channels NUM_CH TYPE: integer Value: application specific (see 143.3.3.2)						
C/ 142 SC 142.2.2 Laubach, Mark	2.4.2 P73 Broadcom	L <b>20</b>	# 595	The NUM_CH constant represents the number of channels supported by an MCRS- based device.						
Comment Type TR Need to add text to c	Comment Status X	ursts relative to t	post-deadline ransmitted user bits.	2) In N NUM_	lx25G-EPON ap CH	plication-speci	fic section, add	the following:	alo channol:	
SuggestedRemedy				Val	2 for devices	supporting 50	Gb/s operation	over two chanr	igle channel, iels.	
Add new paragraph/i "Note - when the last at the end of the Tra	note: codeword of an upstream burs nsmitter User Bits effectively ex	t is shortened, th panding the num	ne shortening bits are aber of Zero Bits (see	2) Mal diagra	ke changes to M ms as shown in	ICRS Input (Fig red in kramer_	y 143-13) and N _3ca_5_0918.pd	MCRS Output (F df.	ig 143-17) state	
Figure 142-6)."				Proposed	Response	Response	Status O			
Proposed Response	Response Status O									
C/ 142 SC 142.2.2	2.4.5 P74	L <b>8</b>	# 594	C/ <b>142</b> Kramer, G	SC 142.2.3.: len	2.4	P <b>88</b> Broadcom	L1	# 592	
Laubach, Mark	Broadcom			Comment	Туре Т	Comment	Status X		post-deadline	
Comment Type TR Need to remove pote	Comment Status X ential confusion of FEC encodin	g versus interlea	post-deadline ver decoding	In ON define waiting	U synchronizer s d as a three-val g for FEC decod	state diagram ( ued logic: (true ling. This is an	Figure 142-16) - successful de unnecessary c	, FecDecoded v ecoding; false - omplicated solu	rariable needs to be failed decoding, Z - tion to a simple	
Delete "encoding and	d"			benav	ior.					
Proposed Response Response Status					Suggesteakerneay					
				booleans: FecDecodeSuccess and FecDecodeFailure. The changes to the state diagram and the definitions of these two variables are provided in kramer_3ca_4_0918.pdf.						
				Proposed	Response	Response	Status <b>O</b>			

C/ 142 SC 142.2.3.2.4