

Proposed Responses

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

Cl **FM** SC P1 L27 # 275
 Marris, Arthur Cadence Design Systems
 Comment Type **ER** Comment Status **D**
 802.3cd is published.
 On page 10 the description of what this amendment does is missing.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change 802.3cd-201x to 802.3cd-2018 here and on page 10
 Also change "IEEE Std 802.3-201x" to "IEEE Std 802.3-2018" throughout the document.
 Also on page 10 replace "This amendment includes [complete]" with appropriate text.
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **FM** SC **FM** P1 L27 # 279
 Wienckowski, Natalie General Motors
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **D** bucket
 802.3cd has been published
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change: 802.3cd-201x
 To: 802.3cd-2018
 Also on P10 L43.
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **FM** SC **FM** P9 L5 # 436
 Powell, William Nokia
 Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **D**
 Current text still refers to 100 Gb/s EPON:
 This introduction is not part of IEEE P802.3ca, IEEE Draft Standard for Ethernet.
 Amendment: Physical Layer Specifications and Management Parameters for 25 Gb/s, 50 Gb/s, and 100 Gb/s Passive Optical Networks.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change to:
 This introduction is not part of IEEE P802.3ca, IEEE Draft Standard for Ethernet.
 Amendment: Physical Layer Specifications and Management Parameters for 25 Gb/s and 50 Gb/s Passive Optical Networks.
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **FM** SC **FM** P10 L31 # 280
 Wienckowski, Natalie General Motors
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **D** bucket
 802.3-2018 has been published
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change: 802.3-201x
 To: 802.3-2018
 Also on P10 L37 & P10 L45.
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **FM** SC **FM** P10 L38 # 282
 Wienckowski, Natalie General Motors
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **D** bucket
 802.3bt also added Annex 145C.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change: Annex 145A, and Annex 145B.
 To: Annex 145A, Annex 145B, and Annex 145C.
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Proposed Responses

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

Cl FM **SC FM** **P10** **L49** # **59**
 Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI, APL Gp, Aquantia, BMW, Cisco
Comment Type **E** **Comment Status** **D** *frontmatter*
 802.3cg, 802.3cn, 802.3cq amendments before this are all missing, as well as the description of 802.3ca - It would be REALLY helpful to see what 802.3ca is intending to put into the standard....
SuggestedRemedy
 Copy 802.3cg, 802.3cm, 802.3cn, and 802.3cq descriptions from 802.3cn D2p1, and fill in a description for 802.3ca.
Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

 Update FrontMatter to the latest version available.

 Include summary description of IEEE Std 802.3ca™-201x as follows:

 Amendment X-This amendment to IEEE Std 802.3-2018 extends the operation of Ethernet Passive Optical Networks (EPONs) to multiple channels of 2 5 Gb/s providing both symmetric and asymmetric operation for the following data rates (downstream/upstream): 25/10 Gb/s, 25/25 Gb/s, 50/10 Gb/s, 50/25 Gb/s, and 50/50 Gb/s. This amendment specifies the 25 Gb/s EPON Multi-Channel Reconciliation Sublayer (MCRS), 25GBASE-PQ Physical Coding Sublayers (PCSs), Physical Media Attachments (PMAs), and Physical Medium Dependent sublayers (PMDs) that support both symmetric and asymmetric data rates while maintaining complete backward compatibility with already deployed 10 Gb/s EPON equipment. The EPON operation is defined for distances of at least 20 km, and for a split ratio of at least 1:32.

Cl FM **SC FM** **P10** **L50** # **64**
 Anslow, Pete Ciena
Comment Type **E** **Comment Status** **D** *frontmatter; bucket*
 The summary text for IEEE Std 802.3ca-20xx is missing
SuggestedRemedy
 Add suitable summary text
Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

 See comment #59

Cl FM **SC FM** **P10** **L52** # **281**
 Wienckowski, Natalie General Motors
Comment Type **E** **Comment Status** **D** *frontmatter; bucket*
 Need to add a description of this ammendment
SuggestedRemedy
 Change: This amendment includes [complete]
 To: This amendment includes changes to IEEE Std 802.3-2018 and adds Clause 141 through Clause 144 and Annex 142A. This amendment extends the operation of Ethernet Passive Optical Networks (EPONs) to multiple channels of 25 Gb/s providing both symmetric and asymmetric operation for the following data rates (downstream/upstream): 25/10 Gb/s, 25/25 Gb/s, 50/10 Gb/s, 50/25 Gb/s, and 50/50 Gb/s. This standard specifies the 25 Gb/s EPON Multi-Channel Reconciliation Sublayer (MCRS), 25GBASE-PQ Physical Coding Sublayers (PCSs), Physical Media Attachments (PMAs), and Physical Medium Dependent sublayers (PMDs) that support both symmetric and asymmetric data rates while maintaining complete backward compatibility with already deployed 10 Gb/s EPON equipment. Backward compatibility with deployed 1G-EPON and ITU-T G.984 GPON is maintained with 25GBASE-PQ for the specific case of 1G-EPON and GPON ONUs using reduced-band (40 nm) lasers. The EPON operation is defined for distances of at least 20 km, and for a split ratio of at least 1:32.
Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

 See comment #59

Cl FM **SC FM** **P20** **L46** # **65**
 Anslow, Pete Ciena
Comment Type **E** **Comment Status** **D** *bucket*
 The TOC entries for Annex 31A and Annex 142A are mixed together and they both say (normative).
SuggestedRemedy
 Fix the TOC
Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Proposed Responses

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

Cl 00 SC 0 P L # 63
 Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI, APL Gp, Aquantia, BMW, Cisco

Comment Type E Comment Status D

PICS Item PQG2510D2F3 value/comment implies that the requirement is labeling. There is no mention of labeling in the requirement itself (note c of Table 141-15). The requirement is a strict 'shall be able to tolerate without damage'. The PICS says the receiver either shall be able to tolerate, OR shall be labeled that it may be damaged. Also, this PICS item is a duplicate of PQG2510D2F2, because that PICS item includes ALL of the receiver requirements in the Table (and the damage requirement is one), so if the requirement allows labeling, the damage threshold needs to be removed from the table.

As best I can tell, IEEE Std 802.3 2018 handles these damage requirements both ways - either excepting with a label, or simply meeting the requirement.

The dominant way appears to be that the requirement is to tolerate the level specified (Clauses 88, 89, 95, 114, 115, 121, 122, and 124 follow this model, see, e.g., PICS 88.12.4.3, or Table 124-7 and PICS 124.12.4.3)

However, Clauses 60 and 75 specify that the requirement may be met, OR the PMD may be labeled. In this case, the requirement to withstand damage is actually to either meet the level OR label appropriately.

The same comment applies to ALL the PMD receiver damage threshold PICS.

SuggestedRemedy

Depending on the intent (see comment):
 Either delete the PICS for the damage threshold.

OR:

strip the damage threshold out of the table into the normative text, and rewrite the requirement in the normative text (in 141.5.2) as such. See, 60.6.2, 75.4.2, 75.5.2 for example text:

"Either the damage threshold of XXX shall be met, or, the receiver shall be labeled to indicate the maximum optical input power level to which it can be continuously exposed without damage."

(where XXX either specifies the separate table with the damage threshold or just puts the level inline in the text - whichever is more straightforward).

(same remedy applies to other receiver damage threshold PICS).

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Delete all the PICS for the damage threshold and associated labelling (e.g., PQG2510D2F3)

Cl 00 SC 0 P0 L0 # 466
 Thompson, Geoff GraCaSI S.A./Independent

Comment Type ER Comment Status D

In all illustrations of the ISO Reference Model, the right end of the Layer dividing line between MAC and Physical Layer is imprecisely placed.

SuggestedRemedy

Place right end of the dashed line precisely at the upper left corner of the MCRS box in all instances.

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 00 SC 0 P0 L0 # 467
 Thompson, Geoff GraCaSI S.A./Independent

Comment Type ER Comment Status D

In all illustrations of the ISO Reference Model, the right end of the Layer dividing line between Data Link and Network Layer is imprecisely placed.

SuggestedRemedy

Place right end of the dashed line precisely at the upper left corner of the MPMC CLIENT box in all instances.

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 00 SC 0 P10 L49 # 58
 Maguire, Valerie The Siemon Company

Comment Type E Comment Status D frontmatter; bucket
 Information for Amendment 4: 802.3cg is missing.

SuggestedRemedy

Insert, "IEEE Std 802.3cg™-20xx Amendment 4—This amendment includes changes to IEEE Std 802.3-2018 and adds Clause 146 through Clause 148 and Annex 146A and Annex 146B. This amendment adds 10 Mb/s Physical Layer specifications and management parameters for operation over a single balanced pair of conductors."

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

See comment #59

Proposed Responses

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

Cl 00 SC 0 P21 L46 # 429
 Dawe, Piers Mellanox
 Comment Type E Comment Status D frontmatter; bucket
 This is too out of date: "other IEEE 802.3 amendment projects running in parallel (e.g., IEEE P802.3bj and IEEE P802.3bk)"
SuggestedRemedy
 Use an up-to-date example, refer to template maintainer to update if not already done
Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 See comment #59

Cl 1 SC 1.3 P22 L8 # 430
 Dawe, Piers Mellanox
 Comment Type T Comment Status D
 According to https://www.itu.int/itu-t/workprog/wp_item.aspx?isn=13348 , G.652-2016 has removed G.652.A and G.652.C, leaving B and D. Yet several clauses will work with A or C; we should not give an impression that they don't.
SuggestedRemedy
 Choose whether you want to include types A and C for the new PMDs. If you do, add a new reference to G.562-2016, leaving G.652-2009 in place. If you don't, it may be simplest to continue with G.652-2009, which remains available.
Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Add a new reference to G.652-2016, leaving G.652-2009 in place. This will allow existing clauses to be pointed to the right location. Make all references to G.652 in .3ca dated 2016.

Cl 1 SC 1.3 P22 L13 # 66
 Anslow, Pete Ciena
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 IEEE references in the in-force standard do not have a date at the end of the title
SuggestedRemedy
 Delete ", 24 July 2017"
Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 1 SC 1.3 P22 L15 # 67
 Anslow, Pete Ciena
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 IEC references in the in-force standard have an em dash in front of "Part" with no spaces on either side. This is also true for other "-" separators in the title.
SuggestedRemedy
 For the IEC reference being added replace " - " before "Performance", "Part", and "Uncontrolled" with an em dash with no spaces before and after.
Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Proposed Responses

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

Cl 1 SC 1.4 P22 L24 # 68
 Anslow, Pete Ciena
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket

The sorting order for definitions in 1.4 is defined at:
http://www.ieee802.org/3/WG_tools/editorial/requirements/words.html#sort
 This order has not been correctly applied to the P802.3ca draft.
 Also, definitions are usually presented in subclause order in amendments.

SuggestedRemedy

In 1.4, change the editing instructions and definition numbering as follows:
 Insert the following new definitions after 1.4.90 "200GXS":
 1.4.90a 25/10G-EPON: ...
 1.4.90b 25/25G-EPON: ...
 Insert the following new definition after 1.4.100 "25GBASE-T":
 1.4.100a 25G-EPON: ...
 Insert the following new definitions before 1.4.128aa "50GBASE-CR" as inserted by IEEE Std 802.3cd-2018:
 1.4.128aaa 50/10G-EPON: ...
 1.4.128aab 50/25G-EPON: ...
 1.4.128aac 50/50G-EPON: ...
 Insert the following new definition after 1.4.128ah "50 Gb/s Media Independent Interface (50GMII)" as inserted by IEEE Std 802.3cd-2018:
 1.4.128ai 50G-EPON: ...
 Insert the following new definitions after 1.4.244 "Energy-Efficient Ethernet (EEE)":
 1.4.244a envelope: ...
 1.4.244b envelope allocation: ...
 1.4.244c envelope descriptor: ...
 Insert the following new definitions after 1.4.245 "envelope frame":
 1.4.245a envelope header: ...
 1.4.245b envelope quantum: ...
 1.4.245c EQT: ...
 Insert the following new definition after 1.4.277 "Gigabit Media Independent Interface (GMII)":
 1.4.277a GPON: ...
 Change 1.4.278 as follows:
 1.4.278 Grant: ...
 Change 1.4.312 (re-numbered from 1.4.313 due to the deletion of 1.4.294 by IEEE Std 802.3bt-2018) as follows:
 1.4.312 Logical Link Identifier (LLID): ...
 Insert new definition for "MCRS channel" after 1.4.319 "maximum differential input" (re-numbered from 1.4.320 due to the deletion of 1.4.294 by IEEE Std 802.3bt-2018) as follows:
 1.4.319a MCRS channel: ...
 Insert new definition for "Nx25G-EPON" after 1.4.350 "NRZI" (re-numbered from 1.4.351 due to the deletion of 1.4.294 by IEEE Std 802.3bt-2018) as follows:

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 1 SC 1.4.90a P22 L45 # 432
 Dawe, Piers Mellanox
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket

the maximum sustained throughput
 SuggestedRemedy
 a maximum sustained throughput (several times)

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 1 SC 1.4.244a P23 L18 # 459
 Thompson, Geoff GraCaSI S.A./Independent
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D

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,"

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED 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.

Proposed Responses

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

Cl 1 SC 1.4.244b P23 L22 # 460

Thompson, Geoff GraCaSI S.A./Independent

Comment Type ER Comment Status D

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.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED 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.

Cl 1 SC 1.4.244b P23 L23 # 28

Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communications

Comment Type ER Comment Status D can-vs-may

"can" used and not intended per Style Guide

SuggestedRemedy

Change "A single GATE MPCPDU can carry up" to "A single GATE MPCPDU may carry up"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

"Can" (i.e., "is able" or "is capable") is correct and is intended. "May" (i.e., "is allowed" or "is permitted") is semantically wrong here.

Cl 1 SC 1.4.244c P23 L26 # 461

Thompson, Geoff GraCaSI S.A./Independent

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

The parameters to not "describe" the timing envelope, they are its defining parameters.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "describe" to "define".

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 1 SC 1.4.244c P23 L26 # 433

Dawe, Piers Mellanox

Comment Type T Comment Status D

I don't know what you mean by "tuple". As you don't bother to use the word anywhere else in this draft, and it doesn't appear in Section 1 with its 507 definitions, it can't be necessary.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to "sequence".

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Both tuple and sequence are wrong here as the ordered set assumes a set of homogenous elements. There is nothing ordered in envelope descriptor.

1.4.244c Envelope descriptor: A record consisting of the following set of parameters: LLID, StartTime, and EnvLength. An envelope descriptor describes a specific envelope pending transmission. Envelope descriptors are generated by the local MPCP sublayer and are passed to MCRS at the appropriate time to start the envelope transmission.

Cl 1 SC 1.4.244d P23 L30 # 462

Thompson, Geoff GraCaSI S.A./Independent

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

The way this currently reads, every envelope and every frame gets this marker at which point it ceases to be a "special marker". The actual meaning and its distinctness need to be described.

SuggestedRemedy

Rewrite the definition text to actually be a distinguishing term that can be understood.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change definition to read: An MCRS-specific marker that is inserted at the beginning of every envelope (Envelope Start Header) and in place of every frame preamble (Envelope Continuation Header). The envelope header includes fields that identify the LLID that sourced the encapsulated data and the length of the data (in units of EQ). Envelope headers also include CRC8 field used to detect bit errors.

Proposed Responses

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

Cl 1 SC 1.4.245a P23 L33 # 463

Thompson, Geoff GraCaSI S.A./Independent

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

This is very confusing. As far as I know, there is no quanta identified within the MAC sub-layer and above that is any finer grained than a MAC Frame. The text implies that the quantification (and identification thereof) exists in the higher layers. This is not true.

SuggestedRemedy

Rewrite so it is more obvious that the quantization only exists within the RS and below.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

This is a fair observation. MAC and MAC Client are not aware of this quantization. The EPON-specific MAC Control and MAC Control Client (out-of-scope for 802.3) are aware of it, just like in previous EPON generations, the MAC Control and MAC Control Client were aware of quantization unit TQ (time quantum). Change the definition as shown below:

1.4.245a Envelope Quantum: A unit of information volume. Each envelope quantum represents 64 bits of data plus the layer-specific encoding. Thus, at the MAC >>>Control<<< sublayer and above, an envelope quantum is equal to 64 bits. Within the MCRS, an envelope quantum contains 72 bits (i.e., 64 bits of data and 8 bits of control). Within PCS, after the 64B/66B encoding, an envelope quantum contains 66 bits.

Cl 1 SC 1.4.245a P23 L35 # 112

Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.

Comment Type T Comment Status D

While the following statement is true for a short time it is not always true (after 267B/256B encoding and EQ would be 64.25 bits) "Within PCS, after the 64B/66B encoding, an envelope quantum contains 66 bits." The stand-a-alone term "EQ" is only used 2x in Cl 142 (pg/line 107/34, 124/17). In both cases the term refers to an observable 72 bit block from the xMII.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the statement "Within PCS, after the 64B/66B encoding, an envelope quantum contains 66 bits."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

If modified as proposed, the definition would be incomplete, since it mentions MAC and higher sublayers, MCRS, but would ignore PCS. It is better to extend the definition as follows: "Within PCS, after the 64B/66B encoding, an envelope quantum contains 66 bit, and after 256B/257B encoding, four envelope quanta are packed into a single 257-bit block."

Cl 1 SC 1.4.245b P23 L38 # 465

Thompson, Geoff GraCaSI S.A./Independent

Comment Type E Comment Status D

It seems like a really bad idea to make this term speed dependent so that the term will not be usable for a like instance at any other speed.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to bit times.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

For the OLT to be able to schedule a mix of 25G and 10G upstream transmissions (for the 25G/25G and 25G/10G coexistence mode), the scheduler needs to have some common reference unit. The EQT was specifically introduced to not depend of bit times. A transmission time of 1 EQ in downstream direction is exactly 1 EQT. In the upstream direction, for ONUs transmitting at 25Gb/s, the transmission time of 1 EQ is also 1 EQT. But for ONUs transmitting at 10Gb/s, the transmission time of 1 EQ is 2.5 EQTs. In other words, EQT is a fixed interval, regardless of the line rate or bit times. It is correct that in some future EPON projects (which don't seem to end), the value of EQT may be different. We expect a future task force to deal with this by making this definition clause- or PON architecture-specific.

Proposed Responses

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

Cl 1 SC 1.4.278 P22 L31 # 431
 Dawe, Piers Mellanox
 Comment Type E Comment Status D
 Contradictory statements about one or multiple upstream bursts.
 Change:
 In Clause 64 ... LLID. Each grant results in one or multiple upstream bursts transmitted by the ONU. In Clause 144, a grant includes envelope allocations for multiple LLIDs. The OLT conveys a grant to the ONU using one or multiple GATE MPCPDUs, all having the same StartTime values. There is a one-to-one correspondence between ...

SuggestedRemedy
 to:
 In Clause 64 ... LLID; each grant results in one or multiple upstream bursts transmitted by the ONU. In Clause 144, a grant includes envelope allocations for multiple LLIDs, the OLT conveys a grant to the ONU using one or multiple GATE MPCPDUs, all having the same StartTime values, and there is a one-to-one correspondence between ...

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The proposed changes would make the definition even more confusing. Use the following updated definition:

1.4.278 Grant: Within P2MP protocols, a permission to transmit at a specific time, for a specific duration. Grants are issued by the OLT (master) to ONUs (slaves) by means of GATE messages. In Clause 64 and Clause 77, a GATE MPCPDU contains one or multiple grants issued to a single LLID, with each grant resulting in one or multiple upstream bursts transmitted by the ONU. In Clause 144, a grant includes envelope allocations for multiple LLIDs and there is a one-to-one correspondence between the grants issued to an ONU and upstream bursts transmitted by that ONU, i.e., a grant issued to an ONU results in a single upstream burst transmitted by that ONU. The OLT conveys a grant to the ONU using one or multiple GATE MPCPDUs, all having the same StartTime values.

Cl 1 SC 1.5 P23 L51 # 69
 Anslow, Pete Ciena
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 "CDR" is already present in 1.5 Abbreviations in the base standard.

SuggestedRemedy
 Remove "CDR clock data recovery" from the list of new abbreviations

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 1 SC 1.5 P23 L52 # 306
 Lynskey, Eric Broadcom
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket, CDR
 CDR is already present in IEEE 802.3-2018.

SuggestedRemedy
 Remove.

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 1 SC 1.5 P23 L52 # 434
 Dawe, Piers Mellanox
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket, CDR
 CDR doesn't stand for clock data recovery

SuggestedRemedy
 Change to clock and data recovery

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #306

Cl 1 SC 1.5 P23 L54 # 70
 Anslow, Pete Ciena
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 New abbreviations are usually presented in alphabetical order

SuggestedRemedy
 Sort the new abbreviations in to alphabetical order

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Proposed Responses

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

Cl 1 SC 1.5 P24 L9 # 260
 D'Ambrosia, John Futurewei, U.S. Subsidiary of Huawei
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 Add abbreviation MCRS
 SuggestedRemedy
 MCRS - multi channel reconciliation sublayer
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 1 SC 1.5 P24 L10 # 71
 Anslow, Pete Ciena
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 According to:
http://www.ieee802.org/3/WG_tools/editorial/requirements/words.html
 "Physical Layer" is "always capped"
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change:
 "PLID physical layer ID" to:
 "PLID Physical Layer ID"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Per comment + change capitalization on page 203/11

Cl 30 SC 30.3.5.1.4 P26 L38 # 327
 Laubach, Mark Broadcom
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D
 The ";" dropped off the end of the line during original editing. This is needed to be consistent with Clause 30 format.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add the ";" to the end of the line.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 30 SC 30.5.1.1.2 P27 L2 # 392
 Dawe, Piers Mellanox
 Comment Type T Comment Status D
 Multiple aMAUTypes with the same description
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add words to distinguish them
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Apply the following changes to MAU description, using 25GBASE-PQG as an example:

- 25GBASE-PQG-D2 One single mode fiber, 1x25G continuous transmission / 1x25G burst mode reception, medium power class, as specified in Clause 141
- 25GBASE-PQG-D3 One single mode fiber, 1x25G continuous transmission / 1x25G burst mode reception, high power class, as specified in Clause 141
- 25GBASE-PQG-U2 One single mode fiber, 1x25G burst mode transmission / 1x25G continuous reception, medium power class, as specified in Clause 141
- 25GBASE-PQG-U3 One single mode fiber, 1x25G burst mode transmission / 1x25G continuous reception, high power class, as specified in Clause 141

Cl 31A SC 31A P246 L16 # 109
 Anslow, Pete Ciena
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 The Value/Comment entry for PAUSE has been in place since the 1998 version of IEEE Std 802.3 without change.
 The Value/Comment entry for GATE has been in place since the 2005 version of IEEE Std 802.3 without change.
 There is no special feature of the P802.3ca draft that requires these changes to be made.
 SuggestedRemedy
 remove the changes shown to these rows of the table.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Retain changes to PAUSE and GATE (missing "s" at the end of verb), remove unchanged rows for REPORT, REGISTER_REQ, REGISTER, and REGISTER_ACK. Update the editorial instruction by adding "(unchanged rows are not shown)" at the end.

Proposed Responses

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

Cl 45 SC 45.2.1 P29 L20 # 72
 Anslow, Pete Ciena
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 The two underlined ellipsis characters in the middle of the table should not be underlined.
 The rows for registers 3.80, 3.81, and 3.82 should be in Table 45-176 not Table 45-3
 SuggestedRemedy
 Delete the row with the two underlined ellipsis characters in the middle of the table.
 Move the rows for registers 3.80, 3.81, and 3.82 to Table 45-176
 Change the bottom ruling of Table 45-3 to the table default.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 45 SC 45.2.1 P29 L20 # 113
 Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 Ellipses need not be shown as added in Table 45-3 7th row.
 SuggestedRemedy
 remove underlining on ellipses.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 45 SC 45.2.1 P29 L29 # 60
 Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI, APL Gp, Aquantia, BMW, Cisco
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 Editing instruction needs to include 802.3cg which also modified Table 45-3.
 SuggestedRemedy
 change "as modified by IEEE Std 802.3cb-2018 and IEEE Std 802.3cd-2018" to "as modified by IEEE Std 802.3cb-2018, IEE Std 802.3cd, and IEEE 802.3cg-201x)
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 45 SC 45.2.1.23a P30 L5 # 75
 Anslow, Pete Ciena
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 The name in the title of 45.2.1.23a.2 is Downstream differential encoding, so this is what should be in the "Name" entry for bit 1.29.15 in Table 45-26a
 SuggestedRemedy
 In Table 45-26a:
 In the Name cell for bit 1.29.15, change "DS_Diff_Enc" to " Downstream differential encoding"
 In the Description cell for bit 1.29.15, change " Downstream differential encoding" to:
 "1 = Downstream differential encoding enabled
 0 = Downstream differential encoding disabled"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 45 SC 45.2.1.23a.1 P29 L37 # 114
 Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 Bit definitions are typically ordered high to low (at least that is how they are defined in 45.2.1.1 - ...3).
 SuggestedRemedy
 Swap sub-clauses so that 45.2.1.23a.2 Downstream Differential Encoding (1.29.15) comes before 45.2.1.23a.1 PMA/PMD type selection (1.29.5:0).
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 45 SC 45.2.1.23a.1 P29 L37 # 73
 Anslow, Pete Ciena
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 The subclauses either side of 45.2.1.23a define the bits in order of largest to smallest.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Swap the order of the definitions so that bit 1.29.15 is defined in 45.2.1.23a.1 and bits 1.29.5:0 in 45.2.1.23a.2
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Proposed Responses

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

Cl 45 SC 45.2.1.23a.1 P29 L41 # 16
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communications
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D
 New "shall" statements were added, but updates to PICS are missing
 SuggestedRemedy
 Updates PICS per hajduczenia_3ca_1_0719.pdf
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 45 SC 45.2.1.23a.2 P29 L45 # 74
 Anslow, Pete Ciena
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 In the title of 45.2.1.23a.2 "Downstream Differential Encoding" should be "Downstream differential encoding" (lower case d and e)
 SuggestedRemedy
 In the title of 45.2.1.23a.2 change: "Downstream Differential Encoding" to: "Downstream differential encoding"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 45 SC 45.2.1.23a.2 P29 L50 # 115
 Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 "TX PMA" and "RX PMA" are poorly defined.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change
 "TX PMA" to "transmit PMA" and
 "RX PMA" to "receive PMA"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 45 SC 45.2.1.134a P31 L10 # 393
 Dawe, Piers Mellanox
 Comment Type E Comment Status D
 Table title wraps too short
 SuggestedRemedy
 Make the text box for table title wider
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED REJECT.

When attempting to fit the whole title in a single line, 2-3 characters flow into line 2. Title was forced to be this way on purpose.

Cl 45 SC 45.2.1.134a P31 L15 # 76
 Anslow, Pete Ciena
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D
 Table 45-103a contains PMA/PMD "ability" bits. All of the other registers in Clause 45 containing PMA/PMD "ability" bits use the text:
 "1 = PMA/PMD is able to perform XXGBASE-XXX
 0 = PMA/PMD is not able to perform XXGBASE-XXX"
 The text in Table 45-103a for the PMA/PMD "ability" bits should be consistent with that used for the other PMA/PMD "ability" bits in Clause 45
 These bits are not a compliance statement, they are used to indicate whether a device is able to perform as a particular PMA/PMD type.
 SuggestedRemedy
 In Table 45-103a change the text in the Description column for all PMA/PMD "ability" bits to the form:
 "1 = PMA/PMD is able to perform XXGBASE-XXX-XX
 0 = PMA/PMD is not able to perform XXGBASE-XXX-XX"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Proposed Responses

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

Cl 45 SC 45.2.1.134a P31 L54 # 77
 Anslow, Pete Ciena
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 When tables split across pages, the bottom ruling of the table on the first page should be "very thin"
 SuggestedRemedy
 Make the bottom ruling "very thin" for:
 Table 45-103a at the foot of page 31 and page 32
 Table 45-217a at the foot of page 43
 Table 141-7 at the foot of page 59
 Table 142-5 at the foot of page 118 and page 119
 Table 144-4 at the foot of page 201
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Cl 45 SC 45.2.1.134a.9 P34 L16 # 1
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communications
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 Make sure that the PMD name is not broken across lines.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Applies to 45.2.1.134a.9, 45.2.1.134a.10, 45.2.1.134a.11, 45.2.1.134a.12, 45.2.1.134a.13, 45.2.1.134a.14, 45.2.1.134a.15, 45.2.1.134a.16, 45.2.1.134a.23, 45.2.1.134a.24, 45.2.1.134a.25, 45.2.1.134a.26, 45.2.1.134a.27, 45.2.1.134a.28, 45.2.1.134a.29, 45.2.1.134a.30, 45.2.1.134a.31, 45.2.1.134a.32
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 45 SC 45.2.1.134a.9 P34 L16 # 116
 Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 PMA/PMD name crosses the line.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change the character format so that the line is not broken by the PMD name at the following locations (pg/line): 34/16, 34/22, 34/28, 34/34, 34/40, 34/46, 34/52, 35/4, 35/46, 35/52, 36/4, 36/10, 36/16, 36/22, 36/28, 36/34, 36/40, & 36/46. Editors licenses to fix any others found.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 45 SC 45.2.1.18aa P33 L36 # 472
 Brandt, David Rockwell Automation
 Comment Type E Comment Status D wrong-ballot
 Misspelling
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change: "abilitiy", To: "ability"
 Proposed Response Response Status Z
 PROPOSED REJECT.
 This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.
 No such spelling "abilitiy" found in the draft. Given that 45.2.1.18 does not exist in the draft - is this a comment against P803.2ca?

Cl 45 SC 45.2.1.18ab P33 L43 # 473
 Brandt, David Rockwell Automation
 Comment Type E Comment Status D wrong-ballot
 Misspelling
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change: "abilitiy", To: "ability"
 Proposed Response Response Status Z
 PROPOSED REJECT.
 This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

No such spelling "abilitiy" found in the draft. Given that 45.2.1.18 does not exist in the draft - is this a comment against P803.2ca?

Proposed Responses

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

Cl 45 SC 45.2.3 P38 L12 # 78
 Anslow, Pete Ciena
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 In the new names for registers 3.76, 3.77 and 3.78, 3.79 in Table 45-176, there shouldn't be a comma in "PR10G-EPON, and Nx25GEAPON"
 This is shown correctly in 45.2.3.41 and 45.2.3.42
 SuggestedRemedy
 In the new names for registers 3.76, 3.77 and 3.78, 3.79 in Table 45-176, delete the comma in "PR10G-EPON, and Nx25GEAPON" (2 instances)
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 45 SC 45.2.3 P38 L17 # 79
 Anslow, Pete Ciena
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 The Nx25G-EPON synchronization pattern registers in 45.2.3.45a are registers 3.83 through 3.134
 SuggestedRemedy
 In table 45-176 change "3.83 through 3.135" to "3.83 through 3.134"
 In the reserved row change "3.136 through 3.199" to "3.135 through 3.199"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 45 SC 45.2.3 P39 L3 # 61
 Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI, APL Gp, Aquantia, BMW, Cisco
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 Editing instruction needs to include 802.3cg which also modified Table 45-176.
 SuggestedRemedy
 change "as modified by IEEE Std 802.3cb-2018 and IEEE Std 802.3cd-2018" to "as modified by IEEE Std 802.3cb-2018, IEE Std 802.3cd, and IEEE 802.3cg-201x)
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 45 SC 45.2.3.6.1 P39 L40 # 117
 Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D 45.2.3.6.1
 Register bits 3.9.0 to 3.9.7 appear to all advertise PCS type abilities.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change:
 "bits 3.8.9, 3.8.7:0, and 3.9.15:0." to
 "bits 3.8.9, 3.8.7:0, and 3.9.17:0."
 Note the "1" in 3.9.1x is in strike-out text.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #80

Cl 45 SC 45.2.3.6.1 P39 L41 # 80
 Anslow, Pete Ciena
 Comment Type T Comment Status D 45.2.3.6.1
 The text as modified: "The PCS type abilities of the PCS are advertised in bits 3.8.9, 3.8.7:0, and 3.9.5:0. A PCS shall ignore writes to the PCS type selection bits that select PCS types it has not advertised in the PCS status 2 register." is not correct. It should read: "The PCS type abilities of the PCS are advertised in bits 3.8.9:0, and 3.9.7:0. A PCS shall ignore writes to the PCS type selection bits that select PCS types it has not advertised in the PCS status 2 register or the PCS status 3 register."

SuggestedRemedy
 Change the second and third sentence of 45.2.3.6.1 to: "The PCS type abilities of the PCS are advertised in bits 3.8.9<u>:0</u><s>, 3.8.7:0,</s> and 3.9.<s>1</s><u>7</u>:0. A PCS shall ignore writes to the PCS type selection bits that select PCS types it has not advertised in the PCS status 2 register<u> or the PCS status 3 register</u>."
 Where:
 <u> and </u> are the start and end of underline font
 <s> and </s> are the start and end of strikethrough font
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Proposed Responses

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

Cl 45 SC 45.2.3.8 P40 L8 # 81
 Anslow, Pete Ciena
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 In Table 45-182, row for bit 3.9.7, "apable" should be "capable"
 SuggestedRemedy
 In Table 45-182, row for bit 3.9.7, change "apable" to "capable"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 45 SC 45.2.3.43 P41 L44 # 62
 Zimmerman, George CME Consulting/ADI, APL Gp, Aquantia, BMW, Cisco
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 The font of "and" and "and Nx25G EPON" is smaller than the rest of the text.
 SuggestedRemedy
 fix font of "and", and "an Nx25G EPON"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 45 SC 45.2.3.43 P41 L39 # 84
 Anslow, Pete Ciena
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 "update" is not a valid editing instruction.
 SuggestedRemedy
 In the editing instruction, replace "Update" with "Change"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 45 SC 45.2.3.43 P41 L44 # 492
 Brandt, David Rockwell Automation
 Comment Type E Comment Status D post-deadline; bucket
 Inconsistent font size.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Make fonts the same size.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 45 SC 45.2.3.43 P41 L41 # 85
 Anslow, Pete Ciena
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 One of the changes shown in 45.2.3.43 to the name of register 3.80 (timer changed to interval) is not reflected in Table 45-176.
 Note that another comment proposes to move the row in Table 45-3 for this register to Table 45-176 where it belongs.
 SuggestedRemedy
 After moving the row for register 3.80 from Table 45-3 to Table 45-176, reflect the change from "timer" to "interval" in the register name using underline and strikethrough.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 45 SC 45.2.3.43 P42 L2 # 86
 Anslow, Pete Ciena
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 "76.3.3.4" should be in forest green. "142.3.5.6" should be a cross-reference.
 Equivalent issues in 45.2.3.44.1 and 45.2.3.45
 SuggestedRemedy
 Convert to text and apply character tag "External" to:
 "76.3.3.4" in 45.2.3.43
 "76.3.3.4" in 45.2.3.44.1
 "76.3.3.4" in 45.2.3.45
 Make a cross-reference:
 "142.3.5.6" in 45.2.3.43
 "142.3.5.2" in 45.2.3.44.1
 "142.3.5.6" in 45.2.3.45
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Proposed Responses

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

Cl 45 SC 45.2.3.43 P42 L5 # 328
 Laubach, Mark Broadcom
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 underline of word stopped short
 SuggestedRemedy
 extend the underline to include the last letter in "interval"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 45 SC 45.2.3.44 P42 L25 # 87
 Anslow, Pete Ciena
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 ", and Nx25G EPON" has been inserted after "BER" in the first sentence of 45.2.3.44 instead of before.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Move the insertion of ", and Nx25G EPON" before "BER" in the first sentence of 45.2.3.44 so that it reads "... 10/1GBASE-PRX, and Nx25G EPON BER monitor ..."
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 45 SC 45.2.3.44.1 P42 L49 # 88
 Anslow, Pete Ciena
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 In the first sentence of 45.2.3.44.1, there is a spurious " BER" after "10/1GBASE-PRX"
 SuggestedRemedy
 In the first sentence of 45.2.3.44.1, delete " BER" after "10/1GBASE-PRX"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 45 SC 45.2.3.44.2 P43 L4 # 89
 Anslow, Pete Ciena
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 In the first sentence of 45.2.3.44.2, there is a spurious " BER" after "10/1GBASE-PRX" and " PCS" is missing after the insertion of ", and Nx25G EPON"
 SuggestedRemedy
 In the first sentence of 45.2.3.44.1, delete " BER" after "10/1GBASE-PRX" and add " PCS" after the insertion of ", and Nx25G EPON"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 45 SC 45.2.3.45a P43 L43 # 307
 Lynskey, Eric Broadcom
 Comment Type T Comment Status D
 Table 45-217a holds the 257-bit sync pattern values. Throughout Clause 45, there are a variety of ways that data is stored in a register when it is greater than 16-bits. Sometimes the lower bytes are stored in lower numbered registers (Table 45-242), and sometimes the opposite is true (Table 45-202). The order of the bytes should be stated in this table.
 SuggestedRemedy
 For the SP1 pattern row, change to "The lower 256 bits of SP1. Bit 0 is stored in 3.84.0, and bit 255 is stored in 3.99.15." Similar for SP2 and SP3 patterns. If this doesn't fit well in the table, then move to the text descriptions that follow the table.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 45 SC 45.2.3.45a P43 L47 # 118
 Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D Table 45-217a
 Table 217a is missing a definition for register bits 3.83.6:15
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add as first row of table:
 3.83.15:6 | Reserved | Value always 0 | RO
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Proposed Responses

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

Cl 45 SC 45.2.3.45a P43 L47 # 448
 Nicholl, Shawn Xilinx
 Comment Type E Comment Status D
 SP1, SP2, etc. are already found throughout 802.3-2018 and are used in the context of "Skew Point". Consider a more unique abbreviation for "synchronization pattern". Unique abbreviations aide the general readability and search-ability of the standard.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace SP1 with SPTN1 throughout the document. Same for SP2, SP3, etc. SPTNx is merely a suggestion, any other unique acronym would work, too.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED REJECT.
 Terms are defined consistently. There are many other examples of overlapping acronyms tat do not cause confusion, when read within the right context.
 Also, please note that SP1, SP2, and SP3 are already used to represent two very different things: Service Primitives in C73 and Skew Points in C80 and 83

Cl 45 SC 45.2.3.45a P43 L47 # 119
 Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 Register bits in Cl 45 tables are typically listed from high bit to low bit and low register to high register.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Reorder row for register bits 3.83.5 to 3.83.0 in Table 45-217a in descending bit order.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 45 SC 45.2.3.45a P43 L47 # 90
 Anslow, Pete Ciena
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D Table 45-217a
 The table defining bit allocations in Clause 45 always have bit 15 at the top and descending bit numbers below.
 Ranges of bits within a register are shown as x.x.a:b where a is higher than b bits within a register that are not allocated are shown as reserved.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change the order of rows in Table 45-217a and the bit designations as follows:
 3.83.15:6 | Reserved | Value always 0 | RO
 3.83.5
 3.83.4
 3.83.3
 3.83.2
 3.83.1
 3.83.0
 3.99.15 through 3.84.0
 3.100.15:0
 3.116.15 through 3.101.0
 3.117.15:0
 3.133.15 through 3.118.0
 3.134.15:0
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 45 SC 45.2.3.45a P44 L10 # 120
 Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D
 Backwards the bits are in "3.1xx.0:15"
 SuggestedRemedy
 In 45.2.3.45a.x Change:
 3.100.0:15 to 3.100.15:0 (4x total)
 3.117.0:15 to 3.117.15:0 (4x total)
 3.134.0:15 to 3.134.15:0 (3x total)
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 Hardly a TR comment material

Proposed Responses

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

Cl 45 SC 45.2.3.80.2 P49 L31 # 474
 Brandt, David Rockwell Automation
 Comment Type E Comment Status D wrong-ballot
 Duplicate text
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change: "is detecting is detecting", To: "is detecting"
 Proposed Response Response Status Z
 PROPOSED REJECT.
 This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

Issue not located. Given that 45.2.3.80.2 does not exist in the draft - is this a comment against P803.2ca?

Cl 45 SC 45.2.3.80.4 P49 L47 # 475
 Brandt, David Rockwell Automation
 Comment Type E Comment Status D wrong-ballot
 Description of non-latched source is wrong.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change: "...PCS high BER status bit (3.2324.9)."
 To: "...PCS high RFER status bit (3.2324.9)."
 Proposed Response Response Status Z
 PROPOSED REJECT.
 This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

Issue not located. Given that 45.2.3.80.4 does not exist in the draft - is this a comment against P803.2ca?

Cl 45 SC 45.2.3.8aa P40 L25 # 82
 Anslow, Pete Ciena
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 The heading numbering for 45.2.3.8aa through 45.2.3.11ad should be 45.2.3.8.aa through 45.2.3.8.ad as per the editing instruction.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change the heading numbering for 45.2.3.8aa through 45.2.3.11ad to 45.2.3.8.aa through 45.2.3.8.ad as per the editing instruction.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 45 SC 45.2.3.8aa P40 L28 # 83
 Anslow, Pete Ciena
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 At the end of the paragraph "the 25GBASE-PQ PCS type" should be "the 25/25GBASE-PQ PCS type"
 SuggestedRemedy
 At the end of the paragraph change "the 25GBASE-PQ PCS type" to "the 25/25GBASE-PQ PCS type"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 56 SC 56.1 P47 L1 # 91
 Anslow, Pete Ciena
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 Figures in 802.3 do not have a border round them.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Remove the border from Figure 56-5a
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Proposed Responses

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

Cl 56 SC 56.1 P47 L1 # 395
 Dawe, Piers Mellanox
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 Per IEEE Standards Style Manual, there should be no borders around the graphic. And, it doesn't match figs 56-2 to 5.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Remove the black box round the figure and its title.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 56 SC 56.1 P47 L3 # 400
 Dawe, Piers Mellanox
 Comment Type E Comment Status D
 Rogue capitals
 SuggestedRemedy
 Unless these are proper nouns, change "OLT Control Plane" and "OLT Data Plane" to "OLT control plane" and "OLT data plane" and similarly for ONU. Several occurrences.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 See comment #399

Cl 56 SC 56.1 P47 L3 # 399
 Dawe, Piers Mellanox
 Comment Type T Comment Status D
 Undefined terms "Control Plane", "Data Plane"
 SuggestedRemedy
 Explain
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Change all instances of "Control Plane" to "MAC Control Clients", and "Data Plane" to "MAC Clients"

Cl 56 SC 56.1.2 P46 L32 # 394
 Dawe, Piers Mellanox
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 PON with the nominal MAC data
 SuggestedRemedy
 PON with a nominal MAC data (several places)
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 56 SC 56.1.2 P46 L38 # 378
 Dawe, Piers Mellanox
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D
 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".
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED 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

Proposed Responses

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

Cl 56 SC 56.1.2 P46 L52 # 396
 Dawe, Piers Mellanox
 Comment Type T Comment Status D
 channel - has multiple meanings already - you are introducing a new thing
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change "channel" to "wavelength" (or maybe "MCRS channel", several times. "PCS and PMA channel" can also be changed to "wavelength".
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED REJECT.
 "Channel" is not equivalent to "Wavelength". Channels are defined in MCRS, PCS, and PMA, which are not aware of wavelengths. There are also several sets of wavelength defined for different coexistence classes, and each channel may map to a different wavelength in a different coexistence class. It is possible in some future project to map multiple channels into a single wavelength. The term "channel" is fundamental to the specifications in clause 143. It is very precisely defined and that definition is confined to .3ca only.

Cl 56 SC 56.1.2 P47 L1 # 283
 Wienckowski, Natalie General Motors
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 Why is there a box around Figure 56-5a? There is not a box around the other Clause 56 Figures and this is not they style found in other Clauses.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Remove box around Figure 56-5a.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 56 SC 56.1.2 P47 L19 # 397
 Dawe, Piers Mellanox
 Comment Type T Comment Status D
 "PCS channel" is new, may need more introduction.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Are there two independent, parallel PCSs or are they linked (how)?
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED REJECT.
 No specific text was proposed at this time.

Cl 56 SC 56.1.2 P47 L52 # 255
 D'Ambrosia, John Futurewei, U.S. Subsidiary of Huawei
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 The architectural diagram has a border box around it. Not consistent with other Clause 56 diagrams in IEEE 802.3
 SuggestedRemedy
 delete border box
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 56 SC 56.1.2 P47 L52 # 256
 D'Ambrosia, John Futurewei, U.S. Subsidiary of Huawei
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 Title of diagram not consistent with other similar diagrams in Clause 56 of 802.3
 See also Fig 141-1, p56
 See also Fig 142-1, p.104
 See also Fig 143-17, p 173
 See also Fig 144-2 P 182
 SuggestedRemedy
 rename title of diagram - Figure 56-4—Architectural positioning of EFM: P2MP n X 25G-EPON architecture
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Change title to read Figure 56-5a—Architectural positioning of EFM: P2MP Nx25G-EPON architecture

Proposed Responses

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

Cl 56 SC 56.1.2 P47 L52 # 257

D'Ambrosia, John Futurewei, U.S. Subsidiary of Huawei

Comment Type E Comment Status D

Diagram not drawn in consistent manner with other similar diagrams in Clause 56.
 Example- the vertical 25GMII text inside the diagram- as well as how the entire MII interface is drawn
 See also Fig 141-1, p56
 See also Fig 142-1, p.104
 See also Fig 143-17, p 173
 See also Fig 144-2 P 182

SuggestedRemedy

redraw figure to be consistent with 56-1, 56-2, 56-3, 56-4.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

Diagram is consistent with style in other .3ca clauses.

Cl 56 SC 56.1.3 P48 L38 # 92

Anslow, Pete Ciena

Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket

Editing instructions do not include the project name and not all of the rows of the table are shown.

SuggestedRemedy

Change editing instruction to: "Insert new PMD types at the end of Table 56-1 (below 10GPASS-XR-U entry), as follows (unchanged rows not shown):

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 56 SC 56.1.3 P48 L46 # 93

Anslow, Pete Ciena

Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket

Only one body row of Table 56-1 (containing ellipsis) is shown before the page break.
 As the editing instruction is "Insert", the inserted rows should not be underlined.

SuggestedRemedy

Move the first row of Table 56-1 on to the next page and remove the underlining from the inserted rows.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 56 SC 56.1.3 P50 L21 # 94

Anslow, Pete Ciena

Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket

Editing instructions use the term "paragraph" rather than "statement".
 The "Insert" editing instruction does not use underline to indicate insertion.

SuggestedRemedy

In the editing instruction, change "after the statement" to "after the paragraph".
 Remove the underline from the inserted text.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 56 SC 56.1.3 P50 L25 # 398

Dawe, Piers Mellanox

Comment Type T Comment Status D

You can't make a PON with a single PMD type. Also, there are options.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "All these systems employ a PMD defined in Clause 141." to "All these systems employ PMDs defined in Clause 141."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 56 SC 56.1.3 P51 L6 # 427

Dawe, Piers Mellanox

Comment Type ER Comment Status D

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

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

The clause order follows the clause order used by EPON projects before.

Proposed Responses

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

Cl 56 **SC 56.1.3** **P54** **L5** # **284**

Wienckowski, Natalie General Motors

Comment Type **T** **Comment Status** **D**

Clause 100 was removed from Table 56-3 but wasn't put into Table 56-4.

SuggestedRemedy
Add Clause 100 in Table 56-4.

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

Cl 67 **SC 67** **P55** **L1** # **326**

Laubach, Mark Broadcom

Comment Type **TR** **Comment Status** **D**

Draft is missing updates to Clause 67 for System considerations for Ethernet subscriber access networks

SuggestedRemedy
Update Table 67-1 as per laubach_3ca_1_0719.pdf to add entries for the P802.3ca media types.

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

As proposed, but rather with the followinv changes:
- "50000" to "50 Gb/s",
- "25000" to "25 Gb/s"
- "10000" to "10 Gb/s"
Discuss at the meeting whether we also want to get rid of 10000 and 1000 values for earlier EPON generation - it is hard to look at.

Cl 141 **SC 141** **P55** **L1** # **121**

Rerein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.

Comment Type **E** **Comment Status** **D** *bucket*

It is customary to include an editing instruction prior to new clauses as noted in the WG Template v3.9.

SuggestedRemedy
Insert before Clause 141
"Insert new clauses and corresponding annexes as follows:"

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

Cl 141 **SC 141.1.2** **P56** **L1** # **17**

Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communications

Comment Type **TR** **Comment Status** **D**

Figure 141-1 shows Nx25G-EPON and not EPON.

SuggestedRemedy
Change "EPON" to "Nx25G-EPON" in caption.
Also, we need to show XGMII in there as an option for OLT and ONU, since we also support asymmetric mode of operation with 10Gbps dat arate

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

Change "EPON" to "Nx25G-EPON" in caption.

See comment #122 for XGMII-related changes.

Cl 141 **SC 141.1.2** **P56** **L1** # **122**

Rerein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.

Comment Type **TR** **Comment Status** **D**

In Fig 141-1 (and the other similar figures in 142, 143, & 144) all show two 25GMII interfaces but never indicate use of the XGMII.

SuggestedRemedy
For each of the four figures in 2 places, adjacent to the right of OLT and ONU 25GMII, add "Note 1". Below the graphic and above the key add the following: "Note 1: in some instances of Nx25-EPON one-half of an XGMII (transmit or receive) may be paired with a complementary half (receive or transmit) of a 25GMII to provide a 25Gb/s downstream and 10Gb/s upstream interface."

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

This is true only for channel 0 interface. It is better to add two lettered footnotes:
a) (attached to the first 25GMII interface) - as suggested by commenter
b) (attached to the second 25GMII interface) - "This interface may be absent in devices that do not support 50G-EPON PMDs."

Proposed Responses

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

Cl 141 SC 141.1.3 P55 L31 # 356

Dudek, Mike Marvell
 Comment Type T Comment Status D

Other than it saying DW0 +DW1 for the 50G link in table 141-7 and there being two wavelengths listed in table 141-3 etc. it is not obvious that wdm is being used for 50G.

SuggestedRemedy

Add a sentence at the end of the paragraph (at line 31). "Links supporting 50Gb/s use wavelength division multiplexing on two wavelengths and hence two wavelengths are listed for these links.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Use the following text with terminology alignment:

"Nx25G-EPON PHY Link Types supporting 50 Gb/s use wavelength division multiplexing on two wavelengths; two wavelengths are listed for these links in Table 141-1 through Table 141-5."

Cl 141 SC 141.1.3 P55 L38 # 285

Wienckowski, Natalie General Motors
 Comment Type E Comment Status D

Missing non-breaking spaces in number that have 4 or more digits to the right of the decimal per 13.3.2 of the 2014 IEEE-SA Style Manual.

SuggestedRemedy

Change: 25.78125
 To: 25.781 25

Proposed Response Response Status Z

PROPOSED REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

Cl 141 SC 141.1.3 P55 L39 # 286

Wienckowski, Natalie General Motors
 Comment Type E Comment Status D

Missing non-breaking spaces in number that have 4 or more digits to the right of the decimal per 13.3.2 of the 2014 IEEE-SA Style Manual.

SuggestedRemedy

Change: 10.3125
 To: 10.312 5

Proposed Response Response Status Z

PROPOSED REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

Cl 141 SC 141.1.3 P57 L8 # 287

Wienckowski, Natalie General Motors
 Comment Type E Comment Status D

Missing non-breaking spaces in number that have 4 or more digits to the right of the decimal per 13.3.2 of the 2014 IEEE-SA Style Manual.

SuggestedRemedy

Change: 25.78125
 To: 25.781 25
 Also on P57 L9, P57 L 24, P57 L40, P57 L41, P58 L 6, P58 L7, P66 L11, P67 L13, P71 L11, P72 L13, P73 L18, & P74 L14.

Proposed Response Response Status Z

PROPOSED REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

Proposed Responses

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

Cl 141 SC 141.1.3 P57 L25 # 288
 Wienckowski, Natalie General Motors
 Comment Type E Comment Status D
 Missing non-breaking spaces in number that have 4 or more digits to the right of the decimal per 13.3.2 of the 2014 IEEE-SA Style Manual.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change: 10.3125
 To: 10.312 5
 Proposed Response Response Status Z
 PROPOSED REJECT.
 This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

Cl 141 SC 141.2.5 P58 L1 # 403
 Dawe, Piers Mellanox
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 "A medium PMD power class" and "A high PMD power class" but "The medium power budget class"
 SuggestedRemedy
 Per style manual: use the same name for the same thing, every time.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Change "The medium power budget class" to "The medium PMD power class". Change "high power budget class" to "The high PMD power class"

Cl 141 SC 141.2.5 P58 L50 # 401
 Dawe, Piers Mellanox
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 with the split ratio of
 SuggestedRemedy
 with a split ratio of
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 141 SC 141.2.5 P58 L50 # 402
 Dawe, Piers Mellanox
 Comment Type T Comment Status D
 Will these work over less than 1:16 and/or less than 20 km? As stated, it's all about overload. But that contradicts " \leq x dB".
 SuggestedRemedy
 Rephrase "at least".
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Delete the "at least" statements for both power budgets.

Cl 141 SC 141.2.6 P59 L9 # 18
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communications
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 it would be easier on reader's eyes to see $r_{>1}$ and not r1. Same for r2. This is used only in this clause, so changes are minimum
 SuggestedRemedy
 Per comment
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 141 SC 141.2.6 P59 L17 # 406
 Dawe, Piers Mellanox
 Comment Type E Comment Status D
 "rate class (in Gb/s)", "PMDs operate at Gigabit rates"
 SuggestedRemedy
 Gigabit -> gigabit/s. But actually, G is a multiplier for r1/r2
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Strike entries for G and BASE, since they do not need to be explained at all at this time.

Proposed Responses

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

Cl 141 SC 141.2.6 P59 L18 # 405

Dawe, Piers Mellanox

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

Optical PMDs don't use a baseband signal! 1.2.3 says only "The modulation type (e.g., BASE) indicates how encoded data is transmitted on the medium".

SuggestedRemedy

So far, optical PMDs all have BASE in their name (so in effect, it just signifies Ethernet) and all use "intensity modulation". However, P802.3ct may call coherent PMDs "BASE" too. This cell could be left blank.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Strike entries for G and BASE, since they do not need to be explained at all at this time.

Cl 141 SC 141.2.7 P59 L29 # 408

Dawe, Piers Mellanox

Comment Type T Comment Status D

paired PMDs transmitter launch power and receiver sensitivity

SuggestedRemedy

paired PMD's transmitter launch powers and receiver sensitivities

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change to "paired PMDs' transmitter launch powers and receiver sensitivities"

Cl 141 SC 141.2.7 P59 L29 # 407

Dawe, Piers Mellanox

Comment Type T Comment Status D

"a power budget is a characteristic of a link"

SuggestedRemedy

No, attenuation or "insertion loss" is a characteristic of the link. A power budget is a characteristic of a pair of PMD types, of a link type, or of a class of links.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change

"a power budget is a characteristic of a link"

to

"a power budget is a characteristic of a link type"

Cl 141 SC 141.2.7 P59 L33 # 410

Dawe, Piers Mellanox

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Aside from the notes about "same coexistence mode, either X or G": If one is not interested in coexistence, (or even if one is), in what circumstances can a G connect to another G, or to an X?

SuggestedRemedy

Spell it out clearly

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Add a new sentence on page 59, line 34 (end of existing para): "Connection between G and X coexistence type PMDs is not supported, e.g., 25/10GBASE-PQG-D2 OLT PMD is not interoperable with 25/10GBASE-PQX-U2 due to non-overlapping OLT receiver sensitivity window and ONU transmitter channel range."

Proposed Responses

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

Cl 141 SC 141.2.7 P59 L35 # 329
 Laubach, Mark Broadcom
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 Table 141-7, as table is split across pages, missing bottom ruling of table on page 59 and missing "(continued)" in table title on page 60. This is Framemaker table stuff.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add the ruling. Do the variable thing to add the "(continue)".
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 141 SC 141.2.7 P59 L38 # 409
 Dawe, Piers Mellanox
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 Downstream
 SuggestedRemedy
 Break after the /
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 141 SC 141.2.7 P59 L40 # 19
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communications
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 Footnote (b) location in Table 141-7 is odd (it moved to a new line)
 SuggestedRemedy
 Make sure footnote (b) location is with the main text of the column caption (extend column size a bit)
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 141 SC 141.2.7 P60 L1 # 20
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communications
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 No "(continued)" marker for Table 141-7 caption
 SuggestedRemedy
 Make sure it is added
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 141 SC 141.2.7.1 P60 L19 # 21
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communications
 Comment Type T Comment Status D
 "Table 141-8 illustrates recommended pairings ..." - it implies these are just recommendations and other pairings are possible
 SuggestedRemedy
 Strike "recommended"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 141 SC 141.2.7.1 P60 L41 # 22
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communications
 Comment Type T Comment Status D
 Subclause 141.2.3 refers to coexistence options as coexistence classes and not coexistence modes
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change "support the same coexistence mode" to "support the same coexistence class"
 The same change on Page 61, like 25
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED REJECT.

"support the same coexistence class" is wrong. They either support the same coexistence mode, or they belong to the same coexistence class.

Proposed Responses

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

Cl 141 SC 141.3 P61 L29 # 413

Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket

There are 9 instance of "PQ type PMD" and 15 instances of "Nx25G-EPON PMD". These two terms are synonymous and we should only use one. Note that Fig 141-2 is referred to using PQ type PMDs but the title indicates Nx25F-EPON PMD and Table 141-1 title is " for Nx25G-EPON PMDs" but PMD type is "PQ type PMD". Fewer new terms are easier on the 1st time reader.

SuggestedRemedy

Change all instance of "PQ type PMD" to "25G-EPON PMD"

Note 1x in Cl 142

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change all instance of "PQ type PMD" to "Nx25G-EPON PMD"

Cl 141 SC 141.3.1.1 P61 L50 # 411

Dawe, Piers Mellanox
 Comment Type T Comment Status D

EQT?

SuggestedRemedy

As this is its first apperance, explain, e.g. with a cross-reference

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Insert cross reference to 1.4.245b

Cl 141 SC 141.3.1.2 P62 L1 # 413

Dawe, Piers Mellanox
 Comment Type T Comment Status D

80.3.3.1 has "The IS_UNITDATA_i.request (where i = 0 to n – 1) primitive is used..." Why does this use [] notation for what seems to be an equivalent thing?

SuggestedRemedy

Be consistent. Explain what i is.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Insert "(where i = 0 or 1)", after:

- PMD_UNITDATA[i].request(tx_bit), page 62, line 5
- PMD_UNITDATA[i].indication(rx_bit), page 62, line 18
- PMD_SIGNAL[i].request(tx_enable), page 62, line 31
- PMD_SIGNAL[i].indication(SIGNAL_DETECT), page 62, line 39

Add the statement: "For any indexed test point (e.g., TP1[i]), [i] indicates the channel index, where i = 0 or 1." at the end of para on page 62, line 52.

Cl 141 SC 141.3.1.2 P62 L8 # 412

Dawe, Piers Mellanox
 Comment Type T Comment Status D

signaling speed

SuggestedRemedy

signaling rate

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Change all instances

Cl 141 SC 141.3.3 P64 L2 # 414

Dawe, Piers Mellanox
 Comment Type T Comment Status D

As there are three levels

SuggestedRemedy

Change "higher" to "highest"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Proposed Responses

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

Cl 141 SC 141.3.3 P64 L2 # 355

Dudek, Mike Marvell

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

I could not find which bits are allocated to DW1 and which to DW0. I would have expected that information to be in 141.3.3 and 141.3.4. Does it matter? (I suspect it does).

SuggestedRemedy

Add the extra information or state explicitly that it doesn't matter.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

The PMD transmitter does not stripe the bits it receives from a single electrical interface into multiple wavelength. Instead, the receiver has independent electrical interfaces for each channel and maps each channel to a corresponding wavelength. The assignment of bits to separate channels happens in the MCRS.

Cl 141 SC 141.3.6 P64 L45 # 415

Dawe, Piers Mellanox

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Just saying "it's defined" isn't enough.

SuggestedRemedy

Define it (at a superficial level), or refer to somewhere that does.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

No specific text has been proposed.

Cl 141 SC 141.5 P65 L # 350

Laubach, Mark Broadcom

Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket

There are 48 uses of a plus-minus symbol in the draft. The majority uses a non-breaking space between the symbol and the following number. Suggest making the 5 uses in lines 6 through 7 and 15 through 19 consistent.

SuggestedRemedy

Add the non-breaking space after the plus-minus symbol.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 141 SC 141.5 P65 L24 # 124

Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.

Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket

There are 2 instances of "PQ PHY". Whereas Nx25G-EPON PHY appears 256 times. Random new terms are not desirable.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "PQ PHY" to "Nx25G-EPON PHY"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 141 SC 141.5 P65 L25 # 125

Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.

Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket

There are 2 instances of "PQ compliant". Whereas Nx25G-EPON PHY appears 256 times. Random new terms are not desirable.

SuggestedRemedy

Change all instances of "PQ compliant" to "Nx25G-EPON compliant"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Proposed Responses

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

Cl 141 SC 141.5.1 P66 L16 # 95

Anslow, Pete Ciena
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket

IEEE uses an en-dash as a minus sign
 Empty cells in tables contain an em-dash

SuggestedRemedy

Change the minus sign to an en-dash (Ctrl-q Shft-p) throughout the entire draft. For example:

- 3 instances in Table 141-13
- 3 instances in Table 141-14
- 8 instances in Table 141-15 (and footnote d)
- 9 instances in Table 141-16 (and footnote e)
- 3 instances in Table 141-17
- 3 instances in Table 141-18
- 8 instances in Table 141-19 (and footnote c)
- 8 instances in Table 141-20
- 4 instances in Table 141-21
- etc.

Populate empty table cells with an em-dash (Ctrl-q Shft-q) throughout the entire draft. For example:

- 2 instances in Table 141-13
- 2 instances in Table 141-14
- 2 instances in Table 141-17
- 2 instances in Table 141-18
- etc.

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 141 SC 141.5.1 P66 L22 # 96

Anslow, Pete Ciena
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket

">=" should be a single character (Ctrl-q 8 in Symbol font)
 Same issue in Table 141-14

SuggestedRemedy

change ">=" to a single character (Ctrl-q 8 in Symbol font) here and in Table 141-14 (page 67, line 22)

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 141 SC 141.5.1 P66 L27 # 416

Dawe, Piers Mellanox
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D

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".

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 141 SC 141.5.1 P66 L34 # 417

Dawe, Piers Mellanox
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D

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.

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED REJECT.

No specific new mask hit ratio was proposed.

Proposed Responses

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

Cl 141 SC 141.5.1 P66 L35 # 23
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communications
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D
 "the OMA (min) must exceed this value" - sounds like it is intended to be a hard requirement? If that is the case, it should be converted into a "shall" statement and PICS updated accordingly
 SuggestedRemedy
 Per comment. The same comment applies to page 67, like 35; page 71, line 46, and page 72, line 42
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Convert statement into a "shall" statement and add PICS accordingly.

Cl 141 SC 141.5.2 P68 L3 # 126
 Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D
 50/25GBASE-PQG-D2 and 50/25GBASE-PQX-D2 appear in Table 141-15 twice, once with a single receive wavelength and once with two.
 The same issue exists in Tables 141-16, 141-17 & 141-18.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Remove the 2nd instance (indicating 2 center wavelengths) of both.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 141 SC 141.5.2 P68 L32 # 418
 Dawe, Piers Mellanox
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D
 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 VECP, 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.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED REJECT.
 No specific value was proposed

Cl 141 SC 141.5.2 P68 L35 # 439
 Powell, William Nokia
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D
 Tables 141-15: In addition to "Vertical eye closure penalty", footnote (f) should also apply to "Stressed eye J2 Jitter" and "Stressed eye J9 Jitter" since it refers to all 3 parameters, and to make it consistent with footnote (e) in Table 141-19.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Apply footnote (f) to "Stressed eye J2 Jitter" and "Stressed eye J9 Jitter" in Table 141-15.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 141 SC 141.5.2 P68 L37 # 310
 Lynskey, Eric Broadcom
 Comment Type T Comment Status D
 Table 141-15 references Table 75-6, which does not contain two entries for stressed eye jitter.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Mark this cell as not applicable.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 141 SC 141.5.2 P69 L20 # 437
 Powell, William Nokia
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D Average receive power
 Table 141-16 has an entry for Average receive power, each channel (min) while it's medium power class cousin, Table 141-15, does not, which is not consistent. That entry should be removed per the rationale in comment #279 on D1.1 (John Johnson): "The inclusion of an informative spec on minimum average receive power doesn't serve any purpose to specify a compliant RX. An RX that meets the requirements of maximum receiver sensitivity (OMA) and maximum stressed receiver sensitivity (OMA) is compliant, even for very low values of AVP associated with very high ER signals."
 SuggestedRemedy
 Remove Average receive power, each channel (min) from Table 141-16.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 See comment #446

Proposed Responses

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

Cl 141 SC 141.5.2 P69 L20 # 446

Johnson, John Broadcom
 Comment Type T Comment Status D Average receive power

The inclusion of an informative spec on minimum average receive power doesn't serve any purpose to specify a compliant RX. An RX that meets the requirements of maximum receiver sensitivity (OMA) and maximum stressed receiver sensitivity (OMA) is compliant, even for very low values of AVP associated with very high ER signals. This line should be removed from Table 141-16. (This repeats a comment originally submitted against D1.1)

SuggestedRemedy

Delete the line for "Average receive power, each channel (min)" in Table 141-16 and remove associated footnote (d).

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 141 SC 141.5.2 P69 L20 # 308

Lynskey, Eric Broadcom
 Comment Type T Comment Status D

Table 141-16 references Table 75-6, which does not contain an entry for Average receive power (min).

SuggestedRemedy

Mark this cell as not applicable.

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 141 SC 141.5.2 P69 L37 # 441

Powell, William Nokia
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D

Table 141-16: In addition to "Vertical eye closure penalty", footnote (g) should also apply to "Stressed eye J2 Jitter" and "Stressed eye J9 Jitter" since it refers to all 3 parameters, and to make it consistent with Table 141-19.

SuggestedRemedy

Apply footnote (g) to "Stressed eye J2 Jitter" and "Stressed eye J9 Jitter" in Table 141-16.

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 141 SC 141.5.2 P69 L38 # 309

Lynskey, Eric Broadcom
 Comment Type T Comment Status D

Table 141-16 references Table 75-6, which does not contain two entries for stressed eye jitter.

SuggestedRemedy

Mark this cell as not applicable.

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 141 SC 141.6 P70 L7 # 127

Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type T Comment Status D

Table 141-21 does not list media types as asserted in the following "A PQ compliant transceiver operates over the media types listed in Table 141-21 according to the specifications described in 141.9". We could restructure the table similar to Table 75-14 or change the statement.

SuggestedRemedy

Change:
 "media types listed in" to
 "media meeting the dispersion shown in"

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Comment type was changed to "T".

Cl 141 SC 141.6.2 P73 L39 # 25

Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communications
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D

Explicit "shall" statement with no paired PICS

SuggestedRemedy

Given that the table is normative as is, if this statement needs to be normative on its own, it needs to be added extra into PICS independently. Given that the same statement exists for each OLT and ONU receiver type, we could either add a new statement to 141.10.4.1 (FN13) or add a new statement into each and every PICS subclause for every PMD type (141.10.4.2 onwards). My preference is on the first approach

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Add a new statement to 141.10.4.1 (FN13) to cover this PICS

Proposed Responses

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

Cl 141 SC 141.6.2 P74 L19 # 447
 Johnson, John Broadcom
 Comment Type T Comment Status D Average receive power
 The inclusion of an informative spec on minimum average receive power doesn't serve any purpose to specify a compliant RX. An RX that meets the requirements of maximum receiver sensitivity (OMA) and maximum stressed receiver sensitivity (OMA) is compliant, even for very low values of AVP associated with very high ER signals. This line should be removed from Table 141-20. (This repeats a comment originally submitted against D1.1)
 SuggestedRemedy
 Delete the line for "Average receive power, each channel (min)" in Table 141-20.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 141 SC 141.6.2 P74 L19 # 438
 Powell, William Nokia
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D Average receive power
 Table 141-20 has an entry for Average receive power, each channel (min) while it's medium power class cousin, Table 141-19, does not, which is not consistent. That entry should be removed per the rationale in comment #283 on D1.1 (John Johnson): "The inclusion of an informative spec on minimum average receive power doesn't serve any purpose to specify a compliant RX. An RX that meets the requirements of maximum receiver sensitivity (OMA) and maximum stressed receiver sensitivity (OMA) is compliant, even for very low values of AVP associated with very high ER signals."
 SuggestedRemedy
 Remove Average receive power, each channel (min) from Table 141-20.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 See comment #447

Cl 141 SC 141.6.2 P74 L30 # 440
 Powell, William Nokia
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D
 Tables 141–20: In addition to "Vertical eye closure penalty", footnote (f) should also apply to "Stressed eye J2 Jitter" and "Stressed eye J9 Jitter" since it refers to all 3 parameters, and to make it consistent with footnote (e) in Table 141-19.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Apply footnote (f) to "Stressed eye J2 Jitter" and "Stressed eye J9 Jitter" in Table 141-20.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 141 SC 141.7 P75 L4 # 24
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communications
 Comment Type E Comment Status D
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED REJECT.
 No comment body

Cl 141 SC 141.7.1 P75 L11 # 56
 Kolesar, Paul CommScope
 Comment Type T Comment Status D
 Suboptimal and possibly conflicting reference for insertion loss testing. The ITU reference is mostly for measurements in a factory environment. The IEC reference in clause 141.9.1 is for installed cabling and more relevant to the qualification of cable plant in the field.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace "A suitable test method is described in ITU–T G.650.1." with "Insertion loss measurements of installed fiber cables are made in accordance with IEC 61280–4–2."
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Proposed Responses

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

Cl 141 SC 141.7.2 P75 L18 # 128
 Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type T Comment Status D
 We should note that Table 88-11 specifies "valid 100GBASE-R signal" in some instances.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add to the end of the para "A valid 25G-EPON signal is substituted for the 100GBASE-R signal specified in Table 88-16."
 Highlight Table 88-16 in forest green.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 141 SC 141.7.4 P75 L31 # 419
 Dawe, Piers Mellanox
 Comment Type T Comment Status D
 ANSI/EIA-455-95 is not in the normative references but IEC 61280-1-1 is.
 SuggestedRemedy
 ANSI/EIA-455-95 to IEC 61280-1-1
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 141 SC 141.7.5 P75 L36 # 57
 Kolesar, Paul CommScope
 Comment Type T Comment Status D
 Incorrect reference to test method. Digits appear transposed.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace 61820-2-2 with 61280-2-2.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 141 SC 141.7.9 P76 L # 421
 Dawe, Piers Mellanox
 Comment Type T Comment Status D
 141.7.9.1 reference Tx, 141.7.9.3 reference Rx and 141.7.9.4 (BER) don't apply to the 10G Tx in an ONU.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add text to make this clear, as it is in 141.7.10, Receive sensitivity and 141.7.11, SRS.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Change "141.7.9 Transmitter and dispersion penalty (TDP)" to "141.7.9 Transmitter and dispersion penalty (TDP) for 25G"

Cl 141 SC 141.7.9 P76 L6 # 420
 Dawe, Piers Mellanox
 Comment Type T Comment Status D
 141.7.9 (TDP) references 88.8.5 but 88.8.5.4 says "as defined in 52.9.10.4 ...the BER of 1 x 10^-12". However, 141.7.9.4 says BER of 1 x 10^-2.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change "with an optical channel that meets the requirements listed in 141.7.9.2" to "with the exceptions in 141.7.9.2 and 141.7.9.4".
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Proposed Responses

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

Cl 141 SC 141.7.9.2 P76 L22 # 97
 Anslow, Pete Ciena
 Comment Type T Comment Status D
 The equation for Dmin (Equation 141-1) is the minimum of three terms:
 0
 $0.365 \cdot \lambda \cdot (1 - (1324/\lambda)^4)$
 $0.465 \cdot \lambda \cdot (1 - (1324/\lambda)^4)$
 When λ is greater than 1324 nm, the second and third terms are positive and Dmin is zero.
 When λ is less than 1324 nm, the second and third terms are negative and the third term is always more negative than the second term.
 Consequently, the second term has no effect on the value of Dmin and should be deleted.
 Likewise in the equation for Dmax (Equation 141-2) the second term has no effect on the value of Dmax and should be deleted.

SuggestedRemedy
 In Equation (141-1) delete the second term $0.365 \cdot \lambda \cdot (1 - (1324/\lambda)^4)$ leaving:
 $Dmin = \min(0, 0.465 \cdot \lambda \cdot (1 - (1324/\lambda)^4))$

In Equation (141-2) delete the second term $0.365 \cdot \lambda \cdot (1 - (1300/\lambda)^4)$ leaving:
 $Dmax = \max(0, 0.465 \cdot \lambda \cdot (1 - (1300/\lambda)^4))$

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 141 SC 141.7.9.4 P76 L44 # 129
 Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 This is the only instance of "lane" that doesn't apply to the IEEE address (as in Hoe's Lane) or an xMII lane.

SuggestedRemedy
 Change "lane" to "channel"

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 141 SC 141.7.10 P76 L47 # 130
 Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type T Comment Status D
 Unwarranted Wild Goose Chase . Here -> 141.7.2 -> Table 88-11.
 Also I don't think we define Rx sensitive for test patterns.

SuggestedRemedy
 Change
 "Receiver sensitivity is defined for test patterns in 75.7.3 (10G) and 141.7.2 (25G)." to
 "The test patterns in 75.7.3 (10G) and Table 83-11 (25G) are used to test receiver sensitivity."
 "75.7.3" & "Table 88-11" in forest green.

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Comment type changed to "T"
 After editorial fixes

Change
 "Receiver sensitivity is defined for test patterns in 75.7.3 (10G) and 141.7.2 (25G)." to
 "The test patterns in 75.7.3 (10G) and Table 83-11 (25G) are used to test receiver sensitivity."
 "75.7.3" & "Table 88-11" in forest green.

Cl 141 SC 141.7.10 P76 L48 # 422
 Dawe, Piers Mellanox
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 Receive sensitivity

SuggestedRemedy
 Receiver sensitivity

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Proposed Responses

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

Cl 141 SC 141.7.12 P77 L12 # 424
 Dawe, Piers Mellanox
 Comment Type T Comment Status D
 "When measuring jitter at TP1[i] and TP5[j]" do we give even recommendations for jitter at TP1[i] and TP5[j] in this clause?
 SuggestedRemedy
 Delete? Change to address the jitter measurements we do have (in SRS calibration)?
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED REJECT.
 No specific value was proposed.

Cl 141 SC 141.7.12 P77 L12 # 423
 Dawe, Piers Mellanox
 Comment Type T Comment Status D
 Filtering out the low frequency jitter is a necessary part of the definition, it can't be left "recommended" or there is significant ambiguity.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Usually the same reference CRU as for several other definitions is invoked. This can be done by reference.
 We may need to say more, e.g. references to the jitter metrics such as J2.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED REJECT.
 No specific value was proposed.

Cl 141 SC 141.7.13.1 P78 L7 # 425
 Dawe, Piers Mellanox
 Comment Type T Comment Status D
 Fig 141-3 does not show Toff correctly. 15% does not come into it.
 SuggestedRemedy
 It's simply the time to the average power of OFF transmitter in the relevant table.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Remove the 15% line.

Cl 141 SC 141.7.13.2 P77 L41 # 131
 Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type T Comment Status D
 There is no TP4 in Figure 141-4: "the optical signal at TP3 to an electrical signal at TP4 ..."
 SuggestedRemedy
 Strike "at TP4"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 141 SC 141.7.13.2 P77 L42 # 29
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communications
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D can-vs-may
 "can" used and not intended per Style Guide
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change "A scope, with a variable delay, can measure" to "A scope, with a variable delay, is able to measure"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 141 SC 141.7.13.2 P77 L49 # 26
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communications
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D must-vs-shall
 "must" used and not intended per Style Guide
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change "Notice that only the steady state optical OFF power must be conformed" to "Notice that only the steady state optical OFF power is expected to be conformed"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Proposed Responses

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

Cl 141 SC 141.7.13.2 P78 L1 # 98

Anslow, Pete Ciena
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D 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

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Figures shall be replaced prior to IEEE SA ballot to avoid constant changes in Frame which is a not an optimum drawing tool - for now, it is easier to keep them in Visio

Cl 141 SC 141.7.14 P78 L48 # 132

Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket

The illustration is Figure 141-5 not 141.7.13.2

SuggestedRemedy

Change "141.7.13.2" to "Figure 141-5"

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 141 SC 141.7.14 P78 L48 # 426

Dawe, Piers Mellanox
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket

141.7.13.2

SuggestedRemedy

141.7.14.2

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #132

Cl 141 SC 141.7.14.2 P79 L49 # 27

Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communications
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D

"must" used and not intended per Style Guide

SuggestedRemedy

Change "time must be met in the following scenarios" to "time is expected to be met in the following scenarios"

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 141 SC 141.9.1 P81 L10 # 55

Kolesar, Paul CommScope
 Comment Type T Comment Status D

Outdated reference to 61280-2-4:2000

SuggestedRemedy

This standard was revised in 2014. But the reference should be undated to always imply the latest revision. Remove ":2000" from the reference.

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Proposed Responses

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

Cl 141 SC 141.9.2 P81 L17 # 369
 Dawe, Piers Mellanox
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 described in Table 141-21
 SuggestedRemedy
 given in Table 141-21
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 141 SC 141.9.2 P81 L25 # 100
 Anslow, Pete Ciena
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 In Table 141-21 "20km" should be "20 km" (space between a number and its unit)
 SuggestedRemedy
 In Table 141-21, change "20km" to "20 km" (2 instances)
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 141 SC 141.9.2 P81 L25 # 435
 Dawe, Piers Mellanox
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 Max Dispersion (at 20km)
 SuggestedRemedy
 Max dispersion (at 20 space km)
 Similarly for Min
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 141 SC 141.9.2 P81 L28 # 370
 Dawe, Piers Mellanox
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 section
 SuggestedRemedy
 Make the table full width
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 141 SC 141.9.2 P81 L30 # 99
 Anslow, Pete Ciena
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 The first sentence of footnote b to Table 141-21 is: "These dispersion requirements are satisfied by fibers specified in ITU-T G.652D (low water peak, dispersion unshifted SMF) and ITU-T G.657A (bend-insensitive SMF)."
 The two ITU-T Recommendations are G.652 and G.657. The 2016 version of G.652 (as referenced by the P802.3ca draft) contains specifications for two fiber types G.652.B and G.652.D (note the extra dot between 652 and the letter B or D). The 2009 version of G.657 (as per the base standard) contains specifications for two fiber types G.657 Category A and G.657 Category B. The 2016 version of G.657 (not referenced) contains specifications for two fiber types G.657.A and G.657.B.
 Consequently, the first sentence of footnote b to Table 141-21 is incorrect.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change the first sentence of footnote b to Table 141-21 to either:
 "These dispersion requirements are satisfied by fibers specified in ITU-T G.652 (low water peak, dispersion unshifted SMF) and ITU-T G.657 (bend-insensitive SMF)."
 or:
 "These dispersion requirements are satisfied by G.652.D fibers specified in ITU-T G.652 (low water peak, dispersion unshifted SMF) and G.657 Category A fibers specified in ITU-T G.657 (bend-insensitive SMF)."
 or:
 "These dispersion requirements are satisfied by G.652.D fibers specified in ITU-T G.652 (low water peak, dispersion unshifted SMF) and G.657.A fibers specified in ITU-T G.657 (bend-insensitive SMF)."
 and change the reference in 1.3 to be for the 2016 version of G.657
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Proposed Responses

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

Cl 141 SC 141.10.4.1 P87 L24 # 101
 Anslow, Pete Ciena
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 The PICS proforma tables in 141.10.4.1 do not have the appropriate entries in the "Support" column.
 Same issue in 141.10.4.42 (OM10), 142.5.4, 142.5.5, 143.5.4.2, 144.5.4.1, 144.5.4.2, 144.5.4.4, 144.5.4.5
 SuggestedRemedy
 In 149.11.4.1, 141.10.4.42 (OM10), 142.5.4, 142.5.5, 143.5.4.2, 144.5.4.1, 144.5.4.2, 144.5.4.4, 144.5.4.5 for items with status of:
 "M" change the Support entry to "Yes []"
 "O" change the Support entry to "Yes [] No []"
 "Something:M" change the Support entry to "Yes [] N/A []"
 "Something:O" change the Support entry to "Yes [] No [] N/A []"
 "O.Number" change the Support entry to "Yes [] No []"
 "O/Number" change the Support entry to "Yes [] No []"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 141 SC 141.10.4.42 P101 L43 # 102
 Anslow, Pete Ciena
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 PICS items begin with a "*" when they are referenced by another PICS item in the Status column. "OM10" does not appear in any other Item, so should not begin with a "*"
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change "**OM10" to "OM10"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 142 SC 142 P103 L0 # 290
 Wienckowski, Natalie General Motors
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 There are change bars on the header and footer that should not be there.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Remove change bars on pages 103 through 179
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 142 SC 142.1 P103 L19 # 289
 Wienckowski, Natalie General Motors
 Comment Type E Comment Status D
 Missing non-breaking spaces in number that have 4 or more digits to the right of the decimal per 13.3.2 of the 2014 IEEE-SA Style Manual.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change: 25.78125
 To: 25.781 25
 Also on P107 L27, P107 L31, P109 L41, P138 L17, P138 L18,
 Proposed Response Response Status Z
 PROPOSED REJECT.
 This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

Cl 142 SC 142.1 P105 L1 # 371
 Dawe, Piers Mellanox
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D redraw
 Per style manual "WGs should create their figures using programs that create vector output".
 SuggestedRemedy
 Import the figure a different way, or draw it in Frame. Same for figs 142-5 to 9, 13 to 16 and 18, 143-1 to 9, 12, 13, 15 and 16, 144-3 to 18, 20 to 29, 31 to 34, and 142A-1.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 See comment #98

Cl 142 SC 142.1 P105 L1 # 267

Kramer, Glen Broadcom

Comment Type T Comment Status D

- 1) BER Monotor block is missing in Figure 142-2.
- 2) The PCS Synchronization and Receive Process shall be titled simply PCS Synchronizer Process.
- 3) The receive and transmit paths need to be labelled.
- 4) The bidirectional arrows going to 64B/66B encoder, scrambler, and transcoder are confusing. Each of these functions provides output different than its input. Two separate arrows make it more accurate.

SuggestedRemedy

Update the figure 142-2 as shown in kramer_3ca_3_0719.pdf

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 142 SC 142.1.1.1 P103 L29 # 490

Law, David Hewlett Packard Enterprise

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

There is no operator precedence defined in subclause 142.1.1.1 'State diagrams' or the referenced subclause 21.5. It is therefore unclear if an equations such as ClkXfr AND ParityLeft > 0 used on the transition from the OUTPUT_PARITY_PLACEHOLDERS state back to the OUTPUT_PARITY_PLACEHOLDERS state in Figure 142-11 'PCS Framer Process State Diagram' means (ClkXfr AND ParityLeft) > 0 or ClkXfr AND (ParityLeft > 0).

SuggestedRemedy

Add brackets as necessary to clarify the order used to evaluate state diagram transition conditions.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Set explicitly the order of precedence, per http://www.ieee802.org/3/ca/public/meeting_archive/2019/07/kramer_3ca_6_0719.pdf

Cl 142 SC 142.1.1.1 P103 L34 # 491

Law, David Hewlett Packard Enterprise

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

Subclause 142.1.1.1 'State diagrams' states that 'The notation used in the state diagrams follows the conventions in 21.5.' yet Figure 142-10 'PCS Input Process State Diagram', as an example, uses TxPrev = IBI_EQ AND TxNext != IBI_EQ on the transition from NEXT_VECTOR state to the RESET_XBUF state. According to the referenced subclause 21.5 the '*' symbol is used to represent a Boolean AND (see Table 21-1). Other state diagrams within the IEEE P802.3ca correctly follow the 21.5 conventions, such as Figure 144-5 'Control Parser state diagram'.

SuggestedRemedy

Consistently follow the conventions in 21.5 throughout the IEEE P802.3ca draft.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change "The notation used in the state diagrams follows the conventions in 21.5.", to "The notation used in the state diagrams follows the conventions in 21.5, with exceptions listed in the following subclauses."

Cl 142 SC 142.1.1.3 P105 L3 # 133

Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.

Comment Type T Comment Status D

In Figure 142-2 the statement "@ 2x390.625 MHz" (2x) is only correct for 25GMII. The illustration specifies xMII and should therefore be rate agnostic. Same issue for "@97.65625 MHz" (3x), and "@(25781.25/257)" (3x). Furthermore, while the block sizes are useful they disagree with Figure 142-5.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace the "@xxx" in the figure with notes as follows:

- 1) For 25GMII rate is 2x390.625 MHz, for XGMII rate is 2x156.25 MHz.
- 2) For 25 Gb/s PCS rate is 97.65625 MHz, for 10 Gb/s PCS rate is 39.0625 MHz.
- 3) For 25 Gb/s PCS rate is (25781.25/257) MHz, for 10 Gb/s PCS rate is (10.3125/257) MHz.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

First, these are not rates, these are clock frequencies.

Second, rather than cluttering the entire diagram, it is better to add a single note as follows: "NOTE: All clock frequencies in this diagram are shown for the nominal MAC data rate of 25 Gb/s. For PCS devices supporting the nominal MAC data rate of 10 Gb/s, all clock frequencies are scaled down by a multiplicative coefficient 0.4."

Proposed Responses

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

Cl 142 SC 142.1.1.3 P105 L16 # 134
 Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D
 Misalignment between Fig 142-2, 142-5 and text. Mostly in block sizes transferred between major blocks/fifos.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add a note to the figure "Note: block sizes exclude control bits passed between the PCS Input Process, PCS Framer Process and PCS Transmit Process that are not sent to the PMA.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED REJECT.
 Actually, in this figure, block sizes include the control bits. No changes needed.

Cl 142 SC 142.1.1.3 P105 L42 # 372
 Dawe, Piers Mellanox
 Comment Type T Comment Status D
 "data_vector<m:n> accesses bits n through m inclusively. The nth bit is received earlier than the mth bit.": this is too perverse. Isn't the something.7:0 style that we see in e.g. Clause 45 because the big end is "first"?
 SuggestedRemedy
 Try not to write it more weird than Ethernet bit ordering already is
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Strike the perverse text "The nth bit is received earlier than the mth bit."

Cl 142 SC 142.1.1.3 P105 L45 # 373
 Dawe, Piers Mellanox
 Comment Type T Comment Status D
 This says "Refer to 3.1 for the conventions on bit ordering." 3.1 itself doesn't help, 3.1.1 shows LSB first, specifically for the MAC.
 SuggestedRemedy
 What is this trying to tell us in the context of a PCS, not a MAC?
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The specific text "Refer to 3.1 for the conventions on bit ordering" should say 3.1.1 instead of 3.1, and it should be part of bullet b, not a separate paragraph. This text is intended to clarify that when a vector is treated as a numerical value, bit n represents a bit with lower significance than bit m.
 The TF has decided to combine all conventions used in .3ca into a single subclause and reference this subclause from other .3ca clauses, rather than duplicating identical conventions in different clauses. Since vector notations are used throughout multiple clauses, it is made part of this subclause and we feel that referencing subclause 3.1.1 is appropriate.

Cl 142 SC 142.1.1.4 P105 L51 # 30
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communications
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D can-vs-may
 "can" used and not intended per Style Guide
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change "straightforward and can be replaced by addition" with "straightforward and may be replaced by addition"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Proposed Responses

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

Cl 142 SC 142.1.1.4 P106 L1 # 494
 Brandt, David Rockwell Automation
 Comment Type E Comment Status D post-deadline
 Is there a reason to create a separate set of "State diagram operators"? Clause 1.2.1 lists "State diagram conventions", where some of the operators are defined. If additions were made, state diagrams could reference a consistent definition across the standard - at least moving forward.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Merge new operators into a Clause 1.2.1. Reference this clause.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED REJECT.
 The primary problems with existing definitions is that they are inconsistent and also distributed across multiple clauses, building a confusing lattice of overlapping requirements associated with state diagram conventions. Rather than rely on that, the Task Force decides to clean the conventions and make them non-ambiguous.
 It is not possible to go and retroactively fix the problem, primarily because of the number of legacy clauses that would be affected in the process.

Cl 142 SC 142.1.1.4 P106 L31 # 493
 Brandt, David Rockwell Automation
 Comment Type E Comment Status D post-deadline; bucket
 Decrement operator has no apparent space between first "-" and second "-".
 SuggestedRemedy
 Use a dash character or font with a break between characters.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 142 SC 142.1.1.5 P107 L6 # 374
 Dawe, Piers Mellanox
 Comment Type T Comment Status D
 in this standard
 SuggestedRemedy
 in this clause
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 142 SC 142.1.2 P107 L27 # 375
 Dawe, Piers Mellanox
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 As this is the first use of EQT in this clause, and this is the first project to use EQT
 SuggestedRemedy
 Say what it is, e.g. with a cross-reference.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Add a cross reference to 1.4.245b.

Cl 142 SC 142.1.2 P107 L34 # 135
 Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 "aforementioned delay limits" should be "aforementioned delay variation limits"
 SuggestedRemedy
 per comment
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 142 SC 142.1.3 P107 L28 # 291
 Wienckowski, Natalie General Motors
 Comment Type E Comment Status D
 Missing non-breaking spaces in number that have 4 or more digits to the right of the decimal per 13.3.2 of the 2014 IEEE-SA Style Manual.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change: 10.3125
 To: 10.312 5
 Also on P107 L32, P109 L42, P138 L18, P138 L19,
 Proposed Response Response Status Z
 PROPOSED REJECT.
 This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

Proposed Responses

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

Cl 142 SC 142.1.3 P108 L4 # 436
 Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 This text is duplicated 4-5 lines above.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Strike the duplicate text
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 142 SC 142.1.3.1 P109 L24 # 449
 Nicholl, Shawn Xilinx
 Comment Type E Comment Status D subscript
 This sub-clause uses the notation 0x1-(55)32. Is this sub-script notation defined in the standard? Is it used anywhere else?
 SuggestedRemedy
 Possible remedies:
 1) Make a comment (similar to 49.2.4.1 Notation conventions) that "The subscript in the above sentence means ..."
 2) Simply write out the whole value without short-hand notation
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Add the following statement after para one on this page:
 "NOTE-When a numeric subscript is used, it indicates the number of times the given value is repeated, e.g., 0x(55)4 is a short-form representation of 0x55-55-55-55."

Cl 142 SC 142.1.3.1 P109 L24 # 376
 Dawe, Piers Mellanox
 Comment Type T Comment Status D subscript
 0x1-(55)32 - eh?
 SuggestedRemedy
 Is that 55 in base 32, or 55 repeated 32 times, or what? Be clearer.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 See comment #449

Cl 142 SC 142.1.3.1 P109 L28 # 450
 Nicholl, Shawn Xilinx
 Comment Type E Comment Status D
 Use of hyphens in a hex value is somewhat rare in the standard (101.3.3.1.6 contains some value that include hypens; 103.3.5.1 also). Most of the time hex values are written without hyphens. Consider to remove the hyphens.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Possible remedies:
 1) Replace "0x1-BF-40-18-...." with "0x1BF4018...."
 2) Create a table like "Table 119-2 - 400GBASE-R alignment marker encodings" that contains the values, delimited with commas
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED REJECT.
 A non-hyphenated version of the hex values will become quickly hard to parse. There are just a handful of values and creating tables is not needed.

Cl 142 SC 142.2 P109 L39 # 377
 Dawe, Piers Mellanox
 Comment Type T Comment Status D
 As 802.3 uses "b/s" for the payload rate (MAC data rate), saying "25.78125 Gb/s rate" is misleading.
 SuggestedRemedy
 25.78125 GBd Several similar instances.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 142 SC 142.2 P111 L1 # 452
 Nicholl, Shawn Xilinx
 Comment Type E Comment Status D redraw
 Blurry diagrams. "Figure 142-5 Transmit bit ordering" is blurry. "Figure 142-6 FEC encoder" is blurry. "Figure 142-9 Omega Network 256 Interconnection Network" is blurry. Other diagrams are blurry.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Generate new figures that are crisp.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 See comment #98

Proposed Responses

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

Cl 142 SC 142.2.4.1 P112 L1 # 139
 Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 In most cases we use "parity-check" (with a hyphen). Here and in a few other locations we omit the hyphen. We should be consistent.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change the following instances of "parity check" with "parity-check":
 pg line
 112 1
 114 48
 115 1
 116 12
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 142 SC 142.2.4.1 P112 L3 # 292
 Wienckowski, Natalie General Motors
 Comment Type E Comment Status D
 Missing non-breaking spaces in number that have 4 or more digits to the left of the decimal per 13.3.2 of the 2014 IEEE-SA Style Manual.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change: = 3072 × 17664
 To: = 3 072 × 17 664
 Proposed Response Response Status Z
 PROPOSED REJECT.
 This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

Cl 142 SC 142.2.4.1 P112 L4 # 140
 Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 The "H" in "... matrix H composed by a ..." and "A_{i,j}" in "256 sub-matrices A_{i,j};" should be in italics. Same for other occurrences in these terms, "a_{i,j}", "(_{i,j})", "H_c", "Z", "K", "Kmax", "S", "P", "M", "N", "Nmax", "R", "Rmax", "u", "u1", "u2", "uK", "p", "p1", "p2", "pM", "T", "c", "i", and "k" (in K+1) scatter throughout the text and Figure 142-6 in Cl 142.2.4 and its sub-clauses. Also in Figure 142-13—FEC decoder.
 SuggestedRemedy
 per comment
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 142 SC 142.2.4.1 P112 L13 # 31
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communications
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D can-vs-may
 "can" used and not intended per Style Guide
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change "The parity-check matrix can be described in its compact form" to "The parity-check matrix is described in its compact form"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 142 SC 142.2.4.1 P114 L39 # 442
 Powell, William Nokia
 Comment Type T Comment Status D
 Replace this note:
 "Editor's Note (to be removed prior to publication): Link to the CSV file containing machine readable files to be added here prior to publication."
 SuggestedRemedy
 with:
 "Editor's Note - Later move this file to: <http://standards.ieee.org/downloads/802.3/> "
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Change text of the editorial note to
 Editor's Note (to be removed prior to publication): At publication time seed tables will be published under <http://standards.ieee.org/downloads/802.3/> in a machine readable format.
 Tables are accessible right now at: <http://www.ieee802.org/3/ca/index.shtml>

Proposed Responses

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

Cl 142 SC 142.2.4.1 P114 L39 # 276
 Marris, Arthur Cadence Design Systems
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D
 Delete "Editor's Note (to be removed prior to publication): Link to the CSV file containing machine readable files to be added here prior to publication."
 SuggestedRemedy
 Delete "Editor's Note (to be removed prior to publication): Link to the CSV file containing machine readable files to be added here prior to publication."
 Similar problem on page 249 line 51.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 See comment #442

Cl 142 SC 142.2.4.2 P114 L49 # 293
 Wienckowski, Natalie General Motors
 Comment Type E Comment Status D
 Missing non-breaking spaces in number that have 4 or more digits to the left of the decimal per 13.3.2 of the 2014 IEEE-SA Style Manual.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change: 14592
 To: 14 592
 Also on P114 L54
 Proposed Response Response Status Z
 PROPOSED REJECT.
 This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

Cl 142 SC 142.2.4.2 P114 L51 # 294
 Wienckowski, Natalie General Motors
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 Missing non-breaking spaces in number that have 4 or more digits to the left of the decimal per 13.3.2 of the 2014 IEEE-SA Style Manual.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change: 17664
 To: 17 664
 Proposed Response Response Status Z
 PROPOSED REJECT.
 This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

Cl 142 SC 142.2.4.2 P114 L53 # 295
 Wienckowski, Natalie General Motors
 Comment Type E Comment Status D
 Missing non-breaking spaces in number that have 4 or more digits to the left of the decimal per 13.3.2 of the 2014 IEEE-SA Style Manual.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change: 14392
 To: 14 392
 Proposed Response Response Status Z
 PROPOSED REJECT.
 This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

Cl 142 SC 142.2.4.2 P115 L5 # 296
 Wienckowski, Natalie General Motors
 Comment Type E Comment Status D
 Missing non-breaking spaces in number that have 4 or more digits to the left of the decimal per 13.3.2 of the 2014 IEEE-SA Style Manual.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change: 16962
 To: 16 962
 Proposed Response Response Status Z
 PROPOSED REJECT.
 This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

Proposed 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 # 141
 Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D
 What does (Pi to the -1 power)"info(u*)" and (Pi)parity(p)" mean?
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add a definition of this term. Unfortunately I have no idea what such a definition would be so I can offer no informed suggestions
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED REJECT.
 No text was proposed. Also, by convention, we do not include tutorial material in the body of the standard.

Cl 142 SC 142.2.4.2 P116 L5 # 379
 Dawe, Piers Mellanox
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D
 I don't know what you mean by pi-1info. Similar problem at line 9.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Explain, or better, use more familiar notation
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 append the following sentence to the end of the paragraph on Page 116, Lines 3-5 : "pi(-1)_{info} represents the information bits de-interleaver mapping 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 parity bits interleaver mapping that permutes p" to p*."

Cl 142 SC 142.2.4.2 P116 L7 # 380
 Dawe, Piers Mellanox
 Comment Type T Comment Status D
 What is then interleaved? p" or H?
 SuggestedRemedy
 ?
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 replace "matrix H, which is then" with "matrix H, and p" is then"

Cl 142 SC 142.2.4.2 P116 L16 # 142
 Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type T Comment Status D
 This seems a bit confusing "the M-bit FEC parity bits"
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change to "the M FEC parity bits" (M in italics)
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 "M bits of FEC parity data" is better

Cl 142 SC 142.2.4.2 P116 L18 # 381
 Dawe, Piers Mellanox
 Comment Type E Comment Status D
 is comprised of
 SuggestedRemedy
 comprises
 consists of
 contains
 is composed of
 or possibly other alternatives
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Use "comprises"

Proposed Responses

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

Cl 142 SC 142.2.4.3 P116 L24 # 143

Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.

Comment Type T Comment Status D

It strikes me a odd that the De-interleaver should refer to encoding and the Interleaver to decoding as stated in the following:

"For the purposes here: "De-interleaver" refers to the mapping from transmitted sequence to encoding/decoding sequence (including user and parity). ... "Interleaver" refers to the mapping from encoding/decoding sequence to transmitted sequence."

SuggestedRemedy

Change to:

"For the purposes here: "De-interleaver" refers to the mapping from transmitted sequence to decoding sequence (including user and parity). ... "Interleaver" refers to the mapping from encoding sequence to transmitted sequence."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

Comment type changed to "T"

Unclear what the original problem is.

Cl 142 SC 142.2.4.3 P116 L25 # 382

Dawe, Piers Mellanox

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

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.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED 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 142.2.4.3 P116 L29 # 144

Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.

Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket

We seem to have a mix of "De-interleaver", "de-interleaver", "Interleaver", and "interleaver".

SuggestedRemedy

Be consistent. Change all to initial Caps

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 142 SC 142.2.4.3 P117 L48 # 383

Dawe, Piers Mellanox

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

I don't know what you mean this partial square bracket; it is not explained here or in 1.2 Notation

SuggestedRemedy

Use accessible notation instead: rounddown() or whatever is meant.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Add footnote under the formula, as follows: (copied from 77.2.2.4)

NOTE—The notation $\lfloor x \rfloor$ represents a floor function, which returns the value of its argument x rounded down to the nearest integer.

Cl 142 SC 142.2.4.3 P118 L1 # 481

Slavick, Jeff Broadcom

Comment Type TR Comment Status D machine-readable-files

Editor's note states it should have been removed before WG ballot with URL

SuggestedRemedy

Replace with proper URL

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #111 for changes.

Proposed Responses

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

Cl 142 SC 142.2.4.3 P118 L1 # 443
 Powell, William Nokia
 Comment Type T Comment Status D machine-readable-files
 Replace this note:
 "Editor's Note (to be removed prior to publication): Before entering WG ballot, content of individual seed tables will be published under <http://standards.ieee.org/downloads/802.3/> in a machine readable format"
 SuggestedRemedy
 with:
 "Individual seed tables can be found at:
<http://www.ieee802.org/3/ca/private/xxx>
 [NEED SEED TABLES PLACED AT LINK ABOVE]
 [and later move it to <http://standards.ieee.org/downloads/802.3/>]
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 See comment #111 for changes.

Cl 142 SC 142.2.4.3 P118 L1 # 277
 Marris, Arthur Cadence Design Systems
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D machine-readable-files
 Address the following:
 "Editor's Note (to be removed prior to publication): Before entering WG ballot, content of individual seed tables will be published under <http://standards.ieee.org/downloads/802.3/> in a machine readable format"
 SuggestedRemedy
 Address the following:
 "Editor's Note (to be removed prior to publication): Before entering WG ballot, content of individual seed tables will be published under <http://standards.ieee.org/downloads/802.3/> in a machine readable format"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 See comment #111 for changes.

Cl 142 SC 142.2.4.3 P118 L1 # 111
 Lusted, Kent Intel
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D machine-readable-files
 The editors note states that the machine readable form of the seed tables are posted at <https://standards.ieee.org/downloads.html>. However, the files for 802.3ca are not posted as of 30 May 2019
 SuggestedRemedy
 Post the seed files and remove the editors note.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Change text of the editorial note to
 Editor's Note (to be removed prior to publication): At publication time seed tables will be published under <http://standards.ieee.org/downloads/802.3/> in a machine readable format. Tables are accessible right now at: <http://www.ieee802.org/3/ca/index.shtml>

Cl 142 SC 142.2.4.3 P118 L1 # 103
 Anslow, Pete Ciena
 Comment Type E Comment Status D machine-readable-files
 The editor's note says that "Before entering WG ballot, content of individual seed tables will be published under <http://standards.ieee.org/downloads/802.3/> in a machine readable format"
 However, the draft is in WG ballot and the location <http://standards.ieee.org/downloads/802.3/> is where files for published standards reside.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Publish the files on the P802.3ca web page and include the location with a note and Editor's note equivalent to those on Page 114 lines 36 to 41
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 See comment #111 for changes.

Proposed Responses

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

Cl 142 SC 142.2.4.3 P118 L1 # 145

Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
Comment Type TR Comment Status D machine-readable-files

The information per the Editorial note has not been published at the advertised URL. Liar, Liar pants on fire!

SuggestedRemedy

Post the seed tables at the advertised URL or Post the seed table at some other URL updating the Ed Note appropriately or change "Before entering WG ballot" to "Prior to publication".

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #111 for changes.

The comment is more than aware of where these are posted on .3ca website :)

Cl 142 SC 142.2.4.3 P118 L1 # 384

Dawe, Piers Mellanox
Comment Type TR Comment Status D machine-readable-files

This says "Before entering WG ballot, content of individual seed tables will be published under http://standards.ieee.org/downloads/802.3/ in a machine readable format". But I don't see them there.

SuggestedRemedy

Sort it out.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #111 for changes.

Cl 142 SC 142.2.4.3 P118 L35 # 453

Nicholl, Shawn Xilinx
Comment Type E Comment Status D

Are the hyphen's necessary in Tables 142-5, 142-6? Consider to remove them to be more consistent with other tables in the standard (eg. Table 52-20, Table 115-1, Table 120-2)

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the hyphens from values in the tables 142-5, 142-6.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

Hyphens help with readability of sequences. Trying to parse values without sepaartors is very hard.

Cl 142 SC 142.2.5 P120 L52 # 146

Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Here we state "bit 257 conveying the origin of the block to be either the PCS Input Process (bit 257 is equal to 1) or the PCS Framer Process (bit 257 is equal to 0). The value of bit 257 being one implies that the 257-bit block has been transcoded and scrambled."

Elsewhere we state (pg/ln)

121/51 "The value of bit 257 being one implies that the 257-bit block has been transcoded and scrambled."

123/22 "a binary one indicating the 257-bit block originated in the PCS Input Process"

124/46 "A single bit indicating the accompanying 256B/257B block has been scrambled is appended to the block which is then stored in the InputFifo."

We should be consistent in what this bit indicates.

SuggestedRemedy

At 120/52 (pg/ln) change:

"Various variables and buffers in the PCS are structured as 258-bit wide blocks with bits 0 through 256 holding one line-coding unit (a 257-bit block) and bit 257 conveying the origin of the block to be either the PCS Input Process (bit 257 is equal to 1) or the PCS Framer Process (bit 257 is equal to 0). The value of bit 257 being one implies that the 257-bit block has been transcoded and scrambled." to:

"Various variables and buffers in the PCS are structured as 258-bit wide blocks. Bits 0 through 256 of these 258-bit block hold one line-coding unit (a 257-bit block) and bit 257 indicates the 257-bit block has been transcoded and scrambled (bit 257 is equal to 1) or that the block has not been transcoded and scrambled (bit 257 is equal to 0). The value of bit 257 also implies the origin of the block as being either the PCS Input Process (bit 257 is equal to 1) or the PCS Framer Process (bit 257 is equal to 0)."

At 121/51 change:

"The value of bit 257 being one implies that the 257-bit block has been transcoded and scrambled." to:

"The value of bit 257 being one indicates that the 257-bit block has been transcoded and scrambled."

At 123/22 change:

"a binary one indicating the 257-bit block originated in the PCS Input Process" to:

"a binary one indicating the 257-bit block has or has not been transcoded and scrambled."

At 124/46 change:

"A single bit indicating the accompanying 256B/257B block has been scrambled ..." to:

"A single bit indicating the accompanying 256B/257B block has been transcoded and scrambled ..."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

At 120/52 (pg/ln) change:

"Various variables and buffers in the PCS are structured as 258-bit wide blocks with bits 0 through 256 holding one line-coding unit (a 257-bit block) and bit 257 conveying the origin of the block to be either the PCS Input Process (bit 257 is equal to 1) or the PCS Framer Process (bit 257 is equal to 0). The value of bit 257 being one implies that the 257-bit block has been transcoded and scrambled." to:

"Various variables and buffers in the PCS are structured as 258-bit wide blocks. Bits 0 through 256 of these 258-bit block hold one line-coding unit (a 257-bit block) and bit 257 indicates the 257-bit block has been transcoded and scrambled (bit 257 is equal to 1) or that the block has not been transcoded and scrambled (bit 257 is equal to 0). The value of bit 257 also implies the origin of the block as being either the PCS Input Process (bit 257 is equal to 1) or the PCS Framer Process (bit 257 is equal to 0)."

At 121/51 change:

"The value of bit 257 being one implies that the 257-bit block has been transcoded and scrambled." to:

"The value of bit 257 being one indicates that the 257-bit block has been transcoded and scrambled."

At 123/22 change:

"a binary one indicating the 257-bit block originated in the PCS Input Process" to:

"a binary one indicating the 257-bit block has been transcoded and scrambled."

At 124/46 change:

"A single bit indicating the accompanying 256B/257B block has been scrambled ..." to:

"A single bit indicating the accompanying 256B/257B block has been transcoded and scrambled ..."

Cl 142 SC 142.2.5.1 P121 L14 # 454

Nicholl, Shawn Xilinx

Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket

Value is set to "0x3-CA". Seems like an unconventional use of hyphen.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace "0x3-CA" with "0x3CA"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Proposed Responses

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

Cl 142 SC 142.2.5.1 P121 L30 # 488

Law, David Hewlett Packard Enterprise

Comment Type T Comment Status D subscripts

The meaning of '0x0-(0A)subscript32' is unclear. According to IEEE Std 802.3-2018 subclause 1.2.5 'Hexadecimal notation' 'Numerical values designated by the 0x prefix indicate a hexadecimal interpretation ...' and 'Numerical values designated with a 16 subscript indicate a hexadecimal interpretation of the corresponding number.'. This therefore seems to imply that the 32 subscript indicates a base 32 number, which I doubt is correct. Instead I suspect that this is meant to indicate 0x0A repeated 32 times, but I don't see where that convention is defined.

SuggestedRemedy

Specify the meaning of '0x0-(0A)subscript32'.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Renumber the existing section 142.1.1.2 into 142.1.1.3 and insert the following new section as shown in http://www.ieee802.org/3/ca/public/meeting_archive/2019/07/kramer_3ca_5_0719.pdf

Cl 142 SC 142.2.5.1 P121 L33 # 455

Nicholl, Shawn Xilinx

Comment Type E Comment Status D subscripts

Use of subscript of 32 for the value of IBI258 and also PAR_PLACEHLDR. Similar to previous comment, need to define/explain the notation.

SuggestedRemedy

- Possible remedies:
- 1) Make a comment (similar to 49.2.4.1 Notation conventions) that "The subscript in the above sentence means ..."
 - 2) Simply write out the whole value without short-hand notation

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #488

Cl 142 SC 142.2.5.2 P122 L26 # 330

Laubach, Mark Broadcom

Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket

Missing crossref formatting for "142.1.1.5". Same for line 41.

SuggestedRemedy

Make them into proper cross references.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 142 SC 142.2.5.2 P123 L36 # 331

Laubach, Mark Broadcom

Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket

Missing period after "TxFifo"

SuggestedRemedy

Add the period at the end of the sentence.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 142 SC 142.2.5.3 P123 L3 # 147

Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.

Comment Type T Comment Status D

It would be a kindness to the reader to inform them why "The MSB of each cell is set to zero".

SuggestedRemedy

Add to the end of the sentence " indicating the 257-bit block has or has not been transcoded and scrambled."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Add to the end of the sentence " indicating the 257-bit block has not been transcoded and scrambled."

Proposed Responses

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

Cl 142 SC 142.2.5.3 P124 L11 # 148
 Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 Is the "v" in "of a 72-bit block v" in italics? It doesn't appear to be.
 Same issue at line 14, 22, & 34 ("a[4]" in this case).
 SuggestedRemedy
 Ensure the "v" is italicized.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 142 SC 142.2.5.4.1 P126 L36 # 104
 Anslow, Pete Ciena
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 The PROCESS_DATA state contains 4 instances of "<=" that should be the "Assignment operator" as per the first two rows
 SuggestedRemedy
 In the PROCESS_DATA state change 4 instances of "<=" to the "Assignment operator" as per the first two rows
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 142 SC 142.2.5.4.2 P125 L5 # 332
 Laubach, Mark Broadcom
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 The hyphen for the line break looks awkward.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Suggest making PAR_PLACEHOLDER unbreakable.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 142 SC 142.2.5.4.3 P125 L17 # 149
 Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 Missing "the", "a", or "an"
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change
 "not transmitting, laser is turned on" to
 "not transmitting, the laser is turned on"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 142 SC 142.3 P125 L37 # 333
 Laubach, Mark Broadcom
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 The first of the hypen-bullet lines ends in a period, the other two do not (lines 38 and 39).
 SuggestedRemedy
 Editor to choose how to have consistent (or appropriate) line ending for all three lines.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Remove "." at the end of the first line.

Cl 142 SC 142.3 P125 L38 # 151
 Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D
 No such beast in Figure 142-2 "PCS Synchronizer Process"
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change Figure 142-2 block title from
 "PCS Synchronization & Receive Process" to
 "PCS Synchronizer Process"
 This is deemed easier than changing the text to match the figure 17x.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 The figure 142-2 is wrong, not the text. Change the figure to show a box for BER Monitor Process to the right of FEC decoder.

Proposed Responses

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

Cl 142 SC 142.3 P125 L38 # 150
 Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D
 No such beast in Figure 142-2 "PCS BER Monitor Process (see 142.3.5.6)".
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change
 "— PCS BER Monitor Process (see 142.3.5.6)" to
 "— FEC Decoder (see 142.3.1)"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 142 SC 142.3.1 P125 L43 # 152
 Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type T Comment Status D
 Does the FEC decoder really interleave?
 SuggestedRemedy
 At line 43 Change
 "interleaver/de-interleaver data path." to
 "de-interleaver data path."
 Change title of section 142.3.1.1 from:
 "Receive Interleaving" to
 "Receive De-interleaving"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED REJECT.
 Yes, it does interleave. See the referenced picture.

Cl 142 SC 142.3.1 P126 L20 # 484
 Slavick, Jeff Broadcom
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D
 In Figure 142-10 the exit from NEXT_VECTOR has a conflict in exit criteria. If TxPREV is IBI_EQ and TxNext becomes RATE_ADJ_EQ both the criteria to take the path to WAIT_FOR_VECTOR and RESET_XBUF would be met. So which path should you take?
 SuggestedRemedy
 Resolve the conflict
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED REJECT.

This is a fair observation for the state diagram 142-10 behavior, however such input to the state diagram is precluded by the higher layer (see MCRS, Figure 143-12). The inter-burst idles (IBI-EQ) are transmitted when there is no data to transmit. When data finally appears, the IBI_EQ will be succeeded by data EQ. The first RATE_ADJ_EQ will only appear after 224 data EQs (i.e., after one FEC codeword payload). RATE_ADJ_EQ can never directly follow the IBI_EQ.

Cl 142 SC 142.3.1.1 P126 L1 # 456
 Nicholl, Shawn Xilinx
 Comment Type E Comment Status D redraw
 Font used in state diagrams appears different from most other state diagrams in the standard. This includes "Figure 142-10 PCS Input Process State Diagram", "Figure 142-11 PCS Framer Process State Diagram" and others.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Update the state diagrams to look more like other state diagrams in the standard
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 See comment #98

Proposed Responses

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

Cl 142 SC 142.3.1.1 P126 L2 # 486
 Law, David Hewlett Packard Enterprise
 Comment Type T Comment Status D
 The variable BEGIN is not defined.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add the following variable definition to subclause 142.2.5.2.
 BEGIN
 TYPE: Boolean
 Description: This variable is used when initiating operation of the functional block state diagram. It is set to TRUE following initialization and every reset.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 142 SC 142.3.1.1 P126 L36 # 487
 Law, David Hewlett Packard Enterprise
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 The Assignment operator character defined in Table 21-1 should be used rather than the two separate symbols '<' and '='.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace the four instances of '<=' with the Assignment operator in the PROCESS_DATA state in Figure 142-10.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 142 SC 142.3.1.1 P126 L36 # 495
 Brandt, David Rockwell Automation
 Comment Type E Comment Status D post-deadline; bucket
 Four incorrect symbols are used.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Use the "assignment operator" symbol instead of "<=" in the following 3 assignments:
 xBuffer[0] <= Scramble(xBuffer[0])
 xBuffer[1] <= Scramble(xBuffer[1])
 xBuffer[2] <= Scramble(xBuffer[2])
 xBuffer[3] <= Scramble(xBuffer[3])
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 142 SC 142.3.2 P126 L49 # 457
 Nicholl, Shawn Xilinx
 Comment Type T Comment Status D
 Consider to clarify that the four output blocks from the transcoder are still scrambled.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace "four consecutive 66-bit" with "four consecutive scrambled 66-bit"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 This is a technical comment. Changed type to "T"

Cl 142 SC 142.3.3 P128 L34 # 153
 Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D
 This statement is confusing at best and possibly misleading: "In the OLT, at the beginning of each burst, the descrambler is initialized with the lower 58 bits of the unscrambled value of IBI_EQ, i.e., bits s[0] through s[57] as shown in Figure 142-14 (see 143.3.3.3)."
 First off there are no s[x] bits in the Fig 142-14. The S[x]_Bytes_ shown in Fig 142-14 are after the descrambler. The "i.e., i.e., bits s[0] through s[57] ..." if assumed (a bad idea but what is the reader to do) to be the individual bits of S0..S7 implies that the descrambler is initialized with whatever happens to be in the register after receiving SBD. This is unlikely to be correct. IBI_EQ is a clearly defined constant and needs no qualification from Figure 142-14.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Strike ", i.e., bits s[0] through s[57] as shown in Figure 142-14 "

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED REJECT.
 The proposed text does not help.

Proposed Responses

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

Cl 142 SC 142.3.5.1 P131 L14 # 297
 Wienckowski, Natalie General Motors
 Comment Type E Comment Status D
 Use a non-breaking space in number that have 4 or more digits to the left of the decimal per 13.3.2 of the 2014 IEEE-SA Style Manual, not a comma.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change: 16,962
 To: 16 962
 Proposed Response Response Status Z
 PROPOSED REJECT.
 This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

Cl 142 SC 142.3.5.2 P132 L14 # 154
 Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type T Comment Status D
 Do we test FEC CWs or decode them?
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change (2x in para)
 "a new QC-LDPC codeword is available for testing" to
 "a new QC-LDPC codeword is available for decoding"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED REJECT.
 Comment type changed to "T"
 The testing is done after the FEC codeword has been decoded.

Cl 142 SC 142.3.5.2 P132 L38 # 155
 Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type T Comment Status D
 Well close. MatchCount doesn't track all matches only those before the ONU is in sync
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change:
 "This counter tracks the number of consecutive successful detections of FEC codeword delimiters (FEC_CW_DELIM)." to
 "This counter tracks the number of consecutive successful detections of FEC codeword delimiters (FEC_CW_DELIM) while the ONU is not synchronized to the proper 257-bit block boundary."
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 142 SC 142.3.5.2 P133 L2 # 156
 Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 Persistent-FecFail crosses the line and shouldn't.
 SuggestedRemedy
 per comment
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 142 SC 142.3.5.2 P133 L29 # 157
 Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D
 This statement is clearly not true (see 142.1.3.1) "Once provisioned, this value does not change and is treated as constant by the state diagram."
 SuggestedRemedy
 Strike.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Proposed Responses

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

Cl 142 SC 142.3.5.2 P133 L35 # 158
 Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 PMA_SIGNAL.
 indication(SIGNAL_OK) crosses the line and shouldn't
 SuggestedRemedy
 per comment
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 142 SC 142.3.5.2 P134 L25 # 386
 Dawe, Piers Mellanox
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D PMA
 What PMA_UNITDATA.indication primitive?
 SuggestedRemedy
 I could not find the PMA service interface definition. Add it.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED REJECT.
 The editor agrees with the commenter, but as no specific text proposal was submitted with comment, it is being resolved as rejected for now. The Editor will attempt to create a PMA introduction clause and service primitives clauses for the next meeting

Cl 142 SC 142.3.5.3 P133 L51 # 159
 Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 This is the only instance of "de-coding". There are ~27 instances of decode (or some form of decode).
 SuggestedRemedy
 Remove the hyphen.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 142 SC 142.3.5.3 P134 L5 # 358
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communications
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D
 FecDecode description is a tad cryptic. The FecDecode function to passes one complete FEC codeword cw to the FEC Decoder. The FEC codeword may be full-length or shortened. The codeword length is intrinsic to the parameter cw. Looking at Figure 142-16, this function is just called, but then I guess it is assumed that it generates the output of OutputFifo since that is what is used as input data stream in Figure 142-18. That relationship is not described anywhere, though.

SuggestedRemedy
 To make things simpler to read between state diagrams, it is recommended to make FecDecode function write into OutputFifo explicitly

Option one (preferred), add statement "OutputFifo.Append(FecDecode(RxCwBuf)) in RX_FULL_CW state in Figure 142-16 and Figure 142-15, as well as in state RX_SHORT_CW in Figure 142-15 + Add the following statement at the end of the definition of FecDecode function. "On completion of the FEC decoding operation, the FecDecode function returns a series of 257-bit blocks appended to the OutputFifo."

Option two (less explicit): add only statement in definition of FecDecode function as follows: "On completion of the FEC decoding operation, the FecDecode function returns a series of 257-bit blocks appended to the OutputFifo." - this option still requires a reader to make a connection between two state diagrams via description of the function

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Add statement "OutputFifo.Append(FecDecode(RxCwBuf)) in RX_FULL_CW state in Figure 142-16 and Figure 142-15, as well as in state RX_SHORT_CW in Figure 142-15 + Add the following statement at the end of the definition of FecDecode function. "On completion of the FEC decoding operation, the FecDecode function returns a series of 257-bit blocks appended to the OutputFifo."

Cl 142 SC 142.3.5.3 P134 L25 # 160
 Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 PMA_UNITDATA.indication(
 rx_code_group<256:0>) crosses the line and shouldn't
 SuggestedRemedy
 per comment
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Proposed Responses

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

Cl 142 SC 142.3.5.4 P134 L36 # 334
 Laubach, Mark Broadcom
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 Missing period, end of last sentence of paragpah.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add the period.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 142 SC 142.3.5.7 P136 L45 # 163
 Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 Missing "the"
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change "of Output Process" to "of the Output Process"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 142 SC 142.3.5.4 P135 L13 # 357
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communications
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D
 PCS_BLK_SZ is not defined right now and it does not seem like we have any .
 SuggestedRemedy
 Seems the following simple definition in XXX would suffice
 PCS_BLK_SZ
 Type: unsigned integer
 Description: The PCS_BLK_SZ constant holds the size of the PCS data block.
 Value: 257
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Cl 142 SC 142.3.5.7 P137 L4 # 164
 Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 Figure needs clean-up; Block divider line overrun block boundaries, connectors often don't touch blocks.
 SuggestedRemedy
 per comment
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

PCS_BLK_SZ
 Type: unsigned integer
 Description: The PCS_BLK_SZ constant holds the size of the PCS data block.
 Value: 257
 Unit: bits

Cl 142 SC 142.3.5.7 P137 L42 # 368
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communications
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D
 in Figure 142-18, PayloadLeft variable is initialized in WAIT_FOR_DATA state with FEC_PAYLOAD_SIZE constant, defined in 142.2.5.1 as 56 units of 257-bit blocks. PayloadLeft is, however, decremented every 72 bit-block in OUTPUT_72B_BLOCK state, which means it runs 4 times faster than expected. It will lead to exhaustion of counter ahead of time, and termination of the FEC payload decoding process prematurely.

Cl 142 SC 142.3.5.4 P135 L15 # 485
 Slavick, Jeff Broadcom
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D
 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..."
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

SuggestedRemedy
 Move "PayloadLeft --" operation from OUTPUT_72B_BLOCK to PROCESS_257B_Block, where it will be counting in 257-bit blocks recovered from FEC payload, at the rate that is expected
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Changes per comment. Also, we need to move FEC_PAYLOAD_SIZE definition to 142.3.5.1 and just reference back to 142.2.5.1, as it was done for the FEC_CW_DELIM constant.

Proposed Responses

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

Cl 142 SC 142.4 P137 L53 # 385
 Dawe, Piers Mellanox
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D PMA
 Missing text
 SuggestedRemedy
 Introduce / summarise the PMA
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED REJECT.

The editor agrees that additional explanation for the term "PCS channel" is needed, however the comment is rejected for lack of specific proposed text. The editor will attempt to create a PMA introduction clause and service primitives clauses for the next meeting

Cl 142 SC 142.4.1 P137 L3 # 387
 Dawe, Piers Mellanox
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D
 This isn't an adequate definition of "differential encoding".
 SuggestedRemedy
 Define it properly, including: What is it for? When is it used or useful? What is it - is it "precoding"? Are Xi and Yi bits, 257-bit vectors, or what? What is "Register" - a 1-bit delay? Define what you mean by a + in a circle.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

(1) precoding was used (twice) interchangeably for differential encoding in D2.0 (once in 142.4.2 and once in Figure 142-20). The more commonly used industry term is differential encoding, so precoding will be removed from subsequent draft versions.
 => replace "differential encoding" for "precoding" in two of the following locations
 - Clause 142.4.2
 - Figure 142-20

(2) Text is proposed to be added to clause 142.4 as follows to provide a brief definition of differential encoding and some guidelines on usage.

142.4 Nx25G-EPON PMA

"The PMA includes a downstream differential encoding option at the serial bit rate (output bits represent changes to succeeding input values rather than respect to a given reference). This encoding technique has been shown to allow less expensive optical receiver modules (lower optical modulation bandwidth receivers) and is the recommended PMA operating mode."

(3) Implement changes to Figure 142-19 and Figure 142-20 as shown in http://www.ieee802.org/3/ca/public/meeting_archive/2019/07/powell_3ca_1_0719.pdf (changed marked in red).

Proposed Responses

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

Cl 142 SC 142.4.1 P138 L3 # 165
 Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type T Comment Status D
 What is an "OLT TX PMA"?

SuggestedRemedy
 Change to "OLT transmit PMA"

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Still not good. What is "OLT transmit PMA for downstream"?

Replace "shall be implemented in the OLT TX PMA for downstream" with "shall be implemented in the transmit path of OLT PMA". Update PICS accordingly

Cl 142 SC 142.4.1 P138 L4 # 166
 Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type T Comment Status D
 This sentence is poorly worded:
 "Differential encoding is optional to use by setting the control bit in the register, as defined in Clause 45 register 1.29.15 (see 45.2.1.23a.2)."

SuggestedRemedy
 Change
 "Differential encoding is optional to use by setting the control bit in the register, as defined in Clause 45 register 1.29.15 (see 45.2.1.23a.2)." to
 "Use of differential encoding is optional. Setting the register control bit 1.29.15 (see 45.2.1.23a.2) to a one enables the encoding."

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Comment type changed to "T"

Cl 142 SC 142.4.2 P138 L9 # 167
 Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type T Comment Status D
 What is an "OLT RX PMA function"?

SuggestedRemedy
 Change:
 "Differential decoding shall be implemented in the ONU PMA RX function as shown in Figure 142–20." to
 "Differential decoding shall be implemented in the as shown in Figure 142–20 in the ONU receive PMA."

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Still not good. What is "ONU transmit PMA for downstream"?

Replace "shall be implemented in the OLT TX PMA for downstream" with "shall be implemented in the receive path of ONU PMA". Update PICS accordingly.

Cl 142 SC 142.4.2 P138 L10 # 168
 Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 Change "RX" to "receive"

SuggestedRemedy
 per comment

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 142 SC 142.4.2 P138 L11 # 169
 Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 Clause 45 does not contain "ONU registers"

SuggestedRemedy
 Change
 "mapped to Clause 45 ONU register 1.29.15" to
 "mapped to Clause 45 register bit 1.29.15 (see 45.2.1.23a.2)"
 use live link for xRef.

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Proposed Responses

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

Cl 142 SC 142.4.2 P138 L12 # 335
 Laubach, Mark Broadcom
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 Missing period, end of last sentence of paragraph.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add the period.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 142 SC 142.4.4.1 P138 L13 # 170
 Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 Per Clause 1.5 CDR mean clock and data recovery not clock data recovery
 SuggestedRemedy
 per comment
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 142 SC 142.5.5.4 P135 L2 # 161
 Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D redraw
 Several SDs are not searchable in pdf files (i.e., are imported from some foreign drawing tool).
 SuggestedRemedy
 Redraw SDs in frame native drawing format if not already so.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 See comment #98

Cl 142 SC 142.5.5.5 P135 L37 # 162
 Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type T Comment Status D
 This statement is not quite accurate "In the ONU, shortened FEC codewords are disallowed."
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change
 "In the ONU, shortened FEC codewords are disallowed."
 "In the ONU receive path, shortened FEC codewords are disallowed."
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 142A SC 142A.1 P249 L51 # 445
 Powell, William Nokia
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D
 Replace this note:
 "Editor's Note (to be removed prior to publication): Link to the CSV file containing machine readable files to be added here prior to publication."
 SuggestedRemedy
 with:
 An example set of LDPC test vectors can be found at:
http://www.ieee802.org/3/ca/private/machine-readable/3ca_LDPC_test_vectors.zip in machine readable format.
 [later move it to <http://standards.ieee.org/downloads/802.3/>]
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Change text of the editorial note to
 Editor's Note (to be removed prior to publication): At publication time machine readable files will be published under <http://standards.ieee.org/downloads/802.3/> in a machine readable format. Tables are accessible right now at: <http://www.ieee802.org/3/ca/index.shtml>

Proposed Responses

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

Cl 142A SC 142A.2 P249 L37 # 270
 Kramer, Glen Broadcom
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 Caption number is missing "14". Just says "2A.2"
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add missing text
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 142A SC 142A.2 P249 L37 # 482
 Slavick, Jeff Broadcom
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 The sub-clause shows as "2A.2" instead of 142A.2
 SuggestedRemedy
 Fix it
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 142A SC 142A.2 P249 L37 # 110
 Anslow, Pete Ciena
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 The heading "2A.2 QC-LDPC FEC Encoder Test Vectors" should be "142A.2" not "2A.2"
 SuggestedRemedy
 In the heading "2A.2 QC-LDPC FEC Encoder Test Vectors" change "142A.2" to "2A.2"
 (Re-apply the heading style AH1.A.1)
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 142A SC 142A.2 P249 L51 # 483
 Slavick, Jeff Broadcom
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 machine is mis-spelled in editors note
 SuggestedRemedy
 Fix it
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change text of the editorial note to
 Editor's Note (to be removed prior to publication): At publication time machine readable
 files will be
 published under <http://standards.ieee.org/downloads/802.3/> in a machine readable format.
 Tables are accessible right now at: <http://www.ieee802.org/3/ca/index.shtm>

Cl 143 SC 143.1 P143 L6 # 259
 D'Ambrosia, John Futurewei, U.S. Subsidiary of Huawei
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D
 Multi-channel Reconciliation Layer introduced - noted as connection between multiple macs
 and PHYs. There is no definition provided in 1.4, and if you look at the MCRS in Fig 143-
 1 - it is a mapping function that reconciles the signals at a specific Media
 Independent Interface (MII) to the specific Media Access Control (MAC)-Physical Signaling
 Sublayer (PLS) service
 definitions.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Action 1 - add definition to 1.4 Multi-Channel Reconciliation Layer provide a mapping
 function that reconciles the signals at a specific Media
 Independent Interface (MII) to a specific Media Access Control (MAC)-Physical Signaling
 Sublayer (PLS) service
 definitions.
 Action 2 - change text in 143.1 -This clause describes the Multi-Channel Reconciliation
 Sublayer (MCRS) which enables multiple MACs to
 interface with multiple Physical Layers.
 to
 This clause describes the Multi-Channel Reconciliation Sublayer (MCRS) which enables
 multiple MACs to
 interface with multiple MII's.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED REJECT.

MCRS is just a specialized version of RS, which has been in use for quite a long time now.
 There are no changed to MAC, and how MAC operates in Nx25G-EPON.

Proposed Responses

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

Cl 143 SC 143.1 P143 L37 # 258
 D'Ambrosia, John Futurewei, U.S. Subsidiary of Huawei
 Comment Type E Comment Status D
 The figure is not consistent with other similar figures as noted in other comments, and the text associated with the MII is illegible.
 SuggestedRemedy
 redraw figure to be consistent with diagrams such as 56-1, 56-2, 56-3, 56-4.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED REJECT.
 Current figure emphasizes the purpose of Clause 143, covering MCRS function

Cl 143 SC 143.2.4.2 P145 L23 # 32
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communications
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D can-vs-may
 "can" used and not intended per Style Guide
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change "and can contain at most two partial frames" to "and may contain at most two partial frames"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 143 SC 143.2.4.4 P146 L40 # 336
 Laubach, Mark Broadcom
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 "46.2.1" should be forest green. Same for Page 154, line 52 for "46.1.7.2"
 SuggestedRemedy
 Make it so.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 143 SC 143.2.4.4 P147 L2 # 261
 D'Ambrosia, John Futurewei, U.S. Subsidiary of Huawei
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D
 use of red lines in Fig 143-3. See IEEE-SA Style Guideline - color should not be needed to interpret informatin, and line drawings should be saved as black/white
 See also Fig 143-8, P 152
 SuggestedRemedy
 Save diagram in black /white
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED REJECT.
 Color is not needed to interpret data and not referenced in text in any way

Cl 143 SC 143.2.5 P148 L2 # 496
 Brandt, David Rockwell Automation
 Comment Type E Comment Status D post-deadline; bucket
 Figure 143-5 vertical axis label has characters overlapping.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Use smaller font to prevent characters from overlapping.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 143 SC 143.2.5 P148 L33 # 33
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communications
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D can-vs-may
 "can" used and not intended per Style Guide
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change "can achieve an instantaneous transmission rate of" to "may achieve an instantaneous transmission rate of"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED REJECT.
 "Can" (i.e., "is able" or "is capable") is correct and is intended. "May" (i.e., "is allowed" or "is permitted") is semantically wrong here

Proposed Responses

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

Cl 143 SC 143.2.5.2 P149 L25 # 34
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communications
 Comment Type **ER** Comment Status **D** *can-vs-may*
 "can" used and not intended per Style Guide
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change "Other timing variability can accumulate in the sublayers" to "Other timing variability may accumulate in the sublayers"
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 143 SC 143.3.1 P153 L5 # 171
 Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **D** *bucket*
 The M and N in "M instances of the PLS service interface (one per MAC) and N xMII instances" should be in italics.
 SuggestedRemedy
 per comment
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 143 SC 143.3.1 P153 L14 # 262
 D'Ambrosia, John Futurewei, U.S. Subsidiary of Huawei
 Comment Type **ER** Comment Status **D**
 Vertical text in left / right of diagram of Fig 143-9 is illegible
 SuggestedRemedy
 Use different font to fascilate being able to read text
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 143 SC 143.3.1 P153 L26 # 497
 Brandt, David Rockwell Automation
 Comment Type **T** Comment Status **D** *post-deadline*
 Index is incorrect.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change: "TXC[N]<3:0>", To: "TXC[N-1]<3:0>"
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 This is a technical comment, type changed to "T"

Cl 143 SC 143.3.1 P153 L26 # 172
 Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type **T** Comment Status **D**
 We seem to have acquired an extra TCX in figure 143-9.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change: "TXC[N]<3:0>" to "TXC[N-1]<3:0>"
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Change: "TXC[N]<3:0>" to "TXC[N-1]<3:0>"

Cl 143 SC 143.3.1.1 P153 L41 # 51
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communications
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **D** *bucket*
 Compound adjective
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change "In all single channel RS definitions" to "In all single-channel RS definitions"
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Proposed Responses

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

CI 143 SC 143.3.1.1 P154 L18 # 52
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communications
 Comment Type T Comment Status D
 Statement is not correct: "All transmit 25GMII interfaces share a common clock." - tabel also shows XGMII
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change "All transmit 25GMII interfaces share a common clock." to "All transmit xGMII interfaces share a common clock." under Table 143-1
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Change "All transmit 25GMII interfaces share a common clock." to "All transmit 25GMII and XGMII interfaces share a common clock." under Table 143-1

CI 143 SC 143.3.1.2.1 P155 L18 # 173
 Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 In "This opens an envelope on channel ch for the LLID specified by link_id with a length (in EQs) of env_length. If all channels are idle, the EnvPam variable (see 143.3.3.4) is set to the value of epam (see EnvStartHeader() function definition in 143.3.3.5)."
 "ch", "link_id", "env_length", "EnvPam", "epam" should be in italics.
 SuggestedRemedy
 per comment
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 143 SC 143.3.1.2.2 P155 L25 # 304
 Kramer, Glen Broadcom
 Comment Type T Comment Status D
 The MCRS_CTRL[ch].indication(cw_left) primitive does not take any arguments anymore. It has been corrected everywhere in text, but still remains in the subclause title.
 SuggestedRemedy
 strike "cw_left"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 143 SC 143.3.1.2.2 P155 L26 # 174
 Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 "ch" and "link_id", "env_length", "EnvPam", "epam" should be in italics.
 SuggestedRemedy
 per comment
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 143 SC 143.3.1.2.2 P155 L29 # 35
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communications
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D can-vs-may
 "can" used and not intended per Style Guide
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change "The MPCP can decide whether to issue a new envelope immediately" to "The MPCP may decide whether to issue a new envelope immediately"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 143 SC 143.3.2 P156 L3 # 175
 Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 If we are treating field names as variables (as in CI 144.3.6.x) then all field names in this section should be in italics.
 SuggestedRemedy
 per comment
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Proposed Responses

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

Cl 143 SC 143.3.2 P157 L5 # 105

Anslow, Pete Ciena
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket

The IEEE Style Manual states that for a number range "Dashes should never be used because they can be misconstrued as subtraction signs."
 Several table in the draft violate this rule.

SuggestedRemedy

In table 143-3, change all instances of "x-y" to "x to y"
 Make equivalent change throughout the draft where a hyphen is used to indicate a range including:
 Table 144-2, Table 144-3, Table 144-4, Table 144-7, Table 144-8, Table 144-11, Table 144-12.
 142.4.4.2 page 139, line36 ("20-30")

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 143 SC 143.3.2 P157 L5 # 263

Kramer, Glen Broadcom
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D bit-order

The draft has multiple issues with incorrect endianness of various constants. Per 802.3 conventions, all hexadecimal values are shown with LSB on the right. Thus, the control bits in the EQ representing an envelope header should be 0x01 (i.e., the first octet in an EQ is a control character, the rest are data). But the draft shows the control bits as 0x80 in multiple places.

Also our definitions of IEI_EQ, IBI_EQ, RATE_ADJ_EQ, and PREAMBLE_EQ all show the control bits at the wrong end of the block.

SuggestedRemedy

Apply multiple changes to the draft as shown in kramer_3ca_2_0719.pdf

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Per proposed changes, less changes to Table 143-3 deleted per comment #272

Cl 143 SC 143.3.2 P157 L25 # 272

Kramer, Glen Broadcom
 Comment Type T Comment Status D

It is not true to state that bits E and K are "used by 1904.1". 1904.1 was approved in 2013 and has no knowledge of 802.3ca.

SuggestedRemedy

- There are (at least) three possible solutions:
 1) Table 143-3 provides no new information compared to the preceding Figure 143-10. In addition to everything that the table shows, the figure provides such details as the bit order for various fields and how the header is split across two 25GMII transfers. So, just delete the table.
 2) Change bits E and K to "reserved" and delete all references to IEEE1904.1
 3) If there is a strong desire to lock the bits E and K to 1904.1 (which is too presumptive at this time), then the footnote should say "Reserved for IEEE Std 1904.1". Only one footnote is needed for both bits. If we decide to go this route, in the description column, we should provide the full description of these bits instead of just E and K.

The commenter prefers solution #1.

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Implement option #1

Cl 143 SC 143.3.2.1 P157 L43 # 53

Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communications
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket

The statement "The following test sequences show" is not clear, since associated tables are on the next page.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "The following test sequences show" to "The test sequences in Table 143-4, Table 143-5, and Table 143-6 show"

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Proposed Responses

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

Cl 143 SC 143.3.3 P158 L1 # 273
 Marris, Arthur Cadence Design Systems
 Comment Type E Comment Status D
 Why is some text shaded in Table 143-4?
 SuggestedRemedy
 Remove shading of CRC8 and other shading if appropriate.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED REJECT.
 Shading helps highlight CRC8 field values in different representations. As footnotes to tables 143-5, 143-5, and 143-6 explain, the gray highlight indicates location and calculated value of CRC8 field.

Cl 143 SC 143.3.3.2 P159 L42 # 176
 Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 "are be added" should be "are to be added"
 SuggestedRemedy
 per comment
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 143 SC 143.3.3.3 P161 L37 # 337
 Laubach, Mark Broadcom
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 It would be a good idea to avoid hypenating contant names and any simple math equation where it might having confusing interpretation between minus sign and a hypen. Same for line 43.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Remove the line breaking.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 143 SC 143.3.3.3 P161 L44 # 338
 Laubach, Mark Broadcom
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 End of sentence for Description needs a period.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add the period to the end of sentence.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 143 SC 143.3.3.4 P161 L11 # 177
 Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 "is also as the row index" should be "is also used as the row index"
 SuggestedRemedy
 per comment
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 143 SC 143.3.3.5 P162 L20 # 367
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communications
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D bit-order
 Bit ordering in EnvContHeader and EnvStartHeader function definitions is reversed. In all other cases, we show ranges starting from higher value and ending with lower value. Here, for some reason, the ranges are reversed
 SuggestedRemedy
 Reverse the bit order, for example hdr<0:7> should become hdr<7:0>
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 See comment #263

Proposed Responses

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

Cl 143 SC 143.3.3.5 P163 L28 # 360
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communications
 Comment Type T Comment Status D
 Format definition of EQ structure is missing. It is defined through a comment only
SuggestedRemedy
 A formal definition will be needed, perhaps using C++ style for classes, showing fields defined and how they are defined?

```

struct EQ {
bool Control[8];
int8u Data [8];
}
    
```

 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 143 SC 143.3.3.5 P163 L32 # 366
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communications
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 "," versus ";"
SuggestedRemedy
 change "for(octet_index = 0; octet_index < 8, octet_index++)" to "for(octet_index = 0; octet_index < 8>>>>;<<<<< octet_index++)", change marked in >>>>><<<<<
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 143 SC 143.3.3.5 P163 L32 # 178
 Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D GetMacOctet
 GetMacOctet and IsIdle are not defined
SuggestedRemedy
 Add in alpha order:
 GetMacOctet (link_id) a function that returns eight bits of data from the MAC associated with the passed <italic>link_id</italic>.
 IsIdle(byte) a Boolean function that returns True of all bits in the <italic>byte</italic> are idle.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 See comment #311

Cl 143 SC 143.3.3.5 P163 L33 # 359
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communications
 Comment Type T Comment Status D GetMacOctet
 Function GetMacOctet() used but not formally specified anywhere.
SuggestedRemedy
 Insert a formal definition of GetMacOctet() function as follows:

```

int8u GetMacOctet(ink_id)
    
```

 The GetMacOctet() function retrieves one octet (8 bits) of data from a MAC identified by the link_id parameter and returns it to the calling function.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 See comment #311

Cl 143 SC 143.3.3.5 P163 L33 # 311
 Lynskey, Eric Broadcom
 Comment Type T Comment Status D GetMacOctet
 GetMacOctet function is not defined.
SuggestedRemedy
 Returns an 8-bit vector based on eight PLS_DATA.request primitives. Each bit may take one of four values: ONE, ZERO, DATA_COMPLETE, or IDLE. If the PLS_DATA.request primitive is not able to return a value of ONE, ZERO, or DATA_COMPLETE, a value of IDLE will be returned instead.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Update definitions of GetMacOctet and IsIdle functions per
http://www.ieee802.org/3/ca/public/meeting_archive/2019/07/kramer_3ca_10a_0719.pdf

Proposed Responses

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

Cl 143 SC 143.3.3.5 P163 L34 # 312
 Lynskey, Eric Broadcom
 Comment Type T Comment Status D GetMacOctet
 Idle function is not defined.
 SuggestedRemedy
 A boolean function that returns TRUE if all eight bits of the presented octet have a value of IDLE. Otherwise, it returns FALSE.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 See comment #311

Cl 143 SC 143.3.3.6.2 P165 L1 # 361
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communications
 Comment Type T Comment Status D
 Variable EnvPam used but not initialized in the state diagram or description.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add initialization value to state INIT in Figure 132-12
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Add initialization value (0) to state INIT in Figure 143-12

Cl 143 SC 143.3.3.6.2 P165 L1 # 365
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communications
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D
 In Figure 143-12, data starts being written into EnvTx from wRow of 1 (see INIT state where it is set to 0, and then NEXT_ROW where it is set immediately to 1 before any data is written into EnvTx), while Figure 143-13 starts reading data from rRow equal to 0. This means that at the start of the state diagram, state and content of EnvTx[ch][0] is not defined in any way.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Suggest to change initialization condition in Figure 143-13 to match initialization of EnvTx in Figure 143-12, i.e., change rRow < 0 to rRow < 1. Index wrap-around will do the rest and we can avoid the problem altogether.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 143 SC 143.3.3.6.2 P165 L3 # 489
 Law, David Hewlett Packard Enterprise
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D redraw
 Subclause 2.6.3 'Draft Standard Formatting Requirements' of the IEEE 802.3 Operations Manual states that 'The draft must be provided to the IEEE in Adobe® Framemaker. At a minimum this shall be completed prior to the Sponsor ballot however it is preferable that the draft be maintained in this format for its entire life.'. It appears, however, that at least some of the state diagrams are not in Frame and are instead imported pictures, for example 143-12 and 143-13.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Ensure that Figures are converted to Framemaker prior to Sponsor ballot, the earlier the better to ensure that any errors created during the conversion are caught as soon as possible. If you need help in doing this please let me know.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 See comment #98

Cl 143 SC 143.3.3.6.2 P165 L15 # 364
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communications
 Comment Type T Comment Status D
 Name of CHECK_ENV_SIZE state is rather ill-fitting - there is no envelope size checking done in this state, all it does it prepare filler pattern in case there is no data to send
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change name of CHECK_ENV_SIZE state to PREP_FILLER (for preparing filler EQ pattern)
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 143 SC 143.3.3.6.2 P165 L15 # 363
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communications
 Comment Type T Comment Status D
 Name of CHECK_HEADER state is rather ill-fitting - there is no header check in this state, it is empty in fact
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change name of CHECK_HEADER state to FETCH_ENV (for fetching envelope if MCERS does send request in time)
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Proposed Responses

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

Cl 143 SC 143.3.3.6.2 P165 L15 # 362
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communications
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 Figure 143-12 seems to be using "*" symbol designating "AND" logical operation. All other SDs have been modified to use the new set of definitions. This one was left behind
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change all instances of "*" to "AND" in Figure 143-12
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 143 SC 143.3.4.3 P168 L43 # 179
 Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 "RX_-CLK[ch]" should not cross the line.
 SuggestedRemedy
 per comment
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 143 SC 143.3.3.6.2 P165 L36 # 339
 Laubach, Mark Broadcom
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D
 In Acrobat for my PDF, it looks like a hyphen at the end of "BlkLeft[wCol]-" rather than a minus 1 "- ", like in the end of "EnvLeft[wCol]- " on line 30.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Confirm it should be a minus 1 "- " and make it visibly clear.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 143 SC 143.3.4.4 P169 L15 # 265
 Kramer, Glen Broadcom
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D
 When an envelope header is formed, the CRC8 is calculated over bits 8 through 63 of an EQ. But when the header is received, the IsHeader() function calculates its own CRC8 over bits 0 through 63. These CRC8 values will never match.
 SuggestedRemedy
 In Function IsHeader(...), replace the line "eq<64:71> == CRC8(eq<0:63>);" with the line "eq<71:64> == CRC8(eq<63:8>);"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 143 SC 143.3.3.6.2 P166 L9 # 264
 Kramer, Glen Broadcom
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D
 MCRS Transmit Process (Fig 143-13) and MCRS Receive Process (Fig 143-15) do not use proper bit locations, according to EQ format definition in Figure 143-2.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change both state diagrams as shown in kramer_3ca_1_0719.pdf
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 143 SC 143.3.4.4 P169 L28 # 266
 Kramer, Glen Broadcom
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 Incorrect format for a hexadecimal numeric value
 SuggestedRemedy
 replace 0x0A0A0A0A with 0x0A-0A-0A-0A
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Proposed Responses

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

Cl 143 *SC* 143.3.4.4 *P*169 *L*36 # 180
 Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D** *bucket*
 Make code for OutputToMac(int16 link_id, EQ eq) more condensed and readable by putting comments on same line as instruction, combining comments "// Rx other ctrl. character { // including /T/ (value 0xFD)" etc.
SuggestedRemedy
 per comment
Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 143 *SC* 143.3.4.5.1 *P*171 *L*21 # 181
 Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **D**
 Variable wRow as defined in 143.3.4.3 is a six bit variable but in Fig 143-15 PARSE_HEADER state it is been assigned a 5 bit value. These two sizes should agree.
SuggestedRemedy
 Change RxEQ<4:0> to RxEQ<5:0>
Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 143 *SC* 143.3.4.5.2 *P*172 *L*21 # 182
 Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **D**
 Need to latch localtime on ESH.
SuggestedRemedy
 Between PROCESS_HEADER and UPDATE_ENV_SIZE add the following:
 New state: "CHECK_FOR MPCPDU"
 Action: none
 Exit 1 to UPDATE_ENV_SIZE: else
 Exit 2 to 2nd new state: LinkID[rCo] (is a member of) {TS_LLID}
 2nd new state: "CAPTURE_TIMESTAMP"
 Action: TS(Plid) <= LocalTime
 Exit to UPDATE_ENV_SIZE: UCT
 Define new variables:
 TS_LLID
 Type: list of PLIDs
 Description: A list of all active PLIDs.
 LocalTime
 Type: 32-bit unsigned
 See 144.2.1.2
Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 MCRS cannot check for MPCPDUs. It has no notion of frames. No there is a cnept of LocalTime in MCRS. LocalTime is MPCP variable
 Use http://www.ieee802.org/3/ca/public/meeting_archive/2019/07/kramer_3ca_4_0719.pdf

Proposed Responses

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

Cl 143 SC 143.4.1 P174 L8 # 183
 Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type T Comment Status D
 We have generally agreed to use xMII where appropriate. Also the 25GMII supports 10 Gb/s operation only in a very obtuse manor.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change
 "The MCRS in Nx25G-EPON architecture serves as an interfaces sublayer between the MAC sublayer and 25GMII. The 25GMII interfaces have the following characteristics:" to "The MCRS in Nx25G-EPON architecture serves as an interface sublayer between the MAC and xMII. The xMII interfaces have the following characteristics:"

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED REJECT.
 Comment type changed to "T"
 No, we used xMII in the generic section because future projects may use it with other types of MII. 25G-EPON uses only 25GMII and bullet (a) explicitly says that we can run 25GMII at full 25G rate or at a slower 10G rate, just like clause 49 says that XGMII can run at full 10G rate or at 2.5G and 5G rates. 25GMII here is correct.

Cl 143 SC 143.4.1.1 P174 L17 # 184
 Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 There is no need for an abbreviation which is never used (to say nothing of confusing if used)
 SuggestedRemedy
 Strike "(DC)" and "(UC)"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 143 SC 143.4.1.1 P174 L30 # 404
 Dawe, Piers Mellanox
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 Nx25GEPON
 SuggestedRemedy
 Nx25G-EPON
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 143 SC 143.4.1.1 P174 L42 # 389
 Dawe, Piers Mellanox
 Comment Type E Comment Status D
 Unnecessary line break
 SuggestedRemedy
 Also at line 45
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED REJECT.
 Even with full tabel width, text does not fit correctly and breaks across words. This was done on purpose.

Cl 143 SC 143.4.1.2 P175 L4 # 185
 Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type T Comment Status D 143.4.4
 I don't believe there is a suitable reference to support this statement: "Additional details for MCRS implementations supporting the channel rate asymmetry are provided in 143.4.4."
 SuggestedRemedy
 Strike the statement
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Comment type changed to "T"
 This points to missing details in MCRS specification. Nowhere do we define how to achieve assymetric behavior. Keep the reference for now and add editors note that section 143.4.4 is needed.

Cl 143 SC 143.4.1.2 P175 L5 # 54
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communications
 Comment Type E Comment Status D 143.4.4
 Reference in red
 SuggestedRemedy
 Strike statement "Additional details for MCRS implementations supporting the channel rate asymmetry are provided in 143.4.4"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 See comment #185

Proposed Responses

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

Cl 143 SC 143.4.1.2 P175 L5 # 313
 Lynskey, Eric Broadcom
 Comment Type E Comment Status D 143.4.4
 Subclause 143.4.4 does not exist.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Remove the sentence.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 See comment #185

Cl 143 SC 143.4.1.2 P175 L5 # 388
 Dawe, Piers Mellanox
 Comment Type E Comment Status D 143.4.4
 Apparent cross-reference in red "143.4.4" doesn't work.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 See comment #185

Cl 143 SC 143.4.1.2 P175 L5 # 340
 Laubach, Mark Broadcom
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 "143.4.4" should be a proper crossref and not just RED in color.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Make it a proper cross ref.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 143 SC 143.4.1.2 P175 L10 # 36
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communications
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D can-vs-may
 "can" used and not intended per Style Guide
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change "the channel number asymmetry mechanisms can be combined" to "the channel number asymmetry mechanisms may be combined"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 143 SC 143.4.1.3.2 P175 L39 # 37
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communications
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D can-vs-may
 "can" used and not intended per Style Guide
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change "buffer can be reduced to only two rows" to "buffer may be reduced to only two rows"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 143 SC 143.4.2 P176 L2 # 186
 Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 Missing "The"
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add before: "ONU MCRS always sets the write pointer ..."
 and at line 14 before "PCS receiver synchronizes on start-of-burst delimiter ..."
 and at line 17 before "xMII and is received into ..."
 and at line 17 before "OLT MCRS EnvRx buffer."
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Proposed Responses

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

Cl 143 SC 143.4.2 P176 L28 # 187
 Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D
 What is a DSC_PLID?
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change to DISC_PLID
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 143 SC 143.4.3 P176 L45 # 188
 Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 I believe MPCP has already been introduced in this clause
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change:
 "Multi-Point Control Protocol (MPCP)" to
 "MPCP"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 143 SC 143.5.4.2 P179 L6 # 106
 Anslow, Pete Ciena
 Comment Type T Comment Status D
 The rules for entries in the "Status" column of PICS table are defined in 21.6.2 of the base standard. This does not include "+" as an "or" function.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change "+" to "or" as per previous amendments
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 144 SC 144 P180 L1 # 464
 Thompson, Geoff GraCaSI S.A./Independent
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D
 This clause is out of scope. It is shown in Fig. 144-2 as residing in the MAC sub-layer. This is a Physical Layer project which said it would "extend the operation of EPON protocols". That means to me the augmentation of what is specified in clause 64, not the creation of an entire new specification misplaced in the Physical Layer.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Rewrite the draft to fit what was promised in the PAR. Presumably that will include deleting lause 144.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED REJECT.

The PAR scope states that this project "... also extends the operation of Ethernet Passive Optical Networks (EPON) protocols, such as MultiPoint Control Protocol (MPCP) and Operation Administration and Management (OAM)." Just like previous generations of Multi-Point Control Protocol (MPCP), the new generation uses GATE and REPORT MPCPDUs to provide time-based transmission arbitration for multiple connected ONUs. However, the new MPCP extends the existing MPCP specification by supporting multiple channels, and specifying finer granularity for transition units (2.56 ns EQs instead of 16 ns TQs). There are numerous other enhancements.

The TF strongly disagrees that the statement "extends the operation of Ethernet Passive Optical Networks (EPON) protocols, such as MultiPoint Control Protocol (MPCP)" implies that all the changes need to be confined to one of the existing MPCP clauses (see Clause 64 or Clause 77), and not be defined as a new clause. The TF made a decision to create a new clause instead of modifying an existing clause for clarity of presentation and for the convenience of users of the standard. This is not unlike an earlier WG decision to specify the simplified full-duplex MAC as a separate Annex 4A instead of modifying the operation of the existing CSMA/CD MAC in Clause 4.

Cl 144 SC 144 P244 L6 # 254
 Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D
 MP9b should ref 144.3.7.7 not 144.3.8.7.
 SuggestedRemedy
 per comment
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Proposed Responses

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

Cl 144 SC 144.1 P180 L12 # 189
 Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D
 We report queue occupancy levels not congestion.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change:
 "reporting of congestion" to:
 "reporting queue occupancy"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 Comment type changed to "T"

Cl 144 SC 144.1 P180 L20 # 190
 Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 Missing "the", "a", or "an"
 SuggestedRemedy
 At the following locations (pg/line) change "" to read "":
 180/20 "TDM-based access to P2MP medium" -> "TDM-based access to _the_ P2MP medium"
 181/27 "binding each instance of MAC" -> "binding each instance of _a_ MAC"
 183/3 "upstream transmissions in EPON" -> "upstream transmissions in _an_ EPON"
 186/5 "envelope transmission over multi-channel P2MP media" -> "envelope transmission over _a_ multi-channel P2MP media"
 187/1 "For accuracy of receive clock" -> "For accuracy of _the_ receive clock"
 187/11 "MPCPDU is received from MAC" -> "MPCPDU is received from _the_ MAC"
 189/35 "To achieve this goal, MPCP includes processes that measure range" -> "To achieve this goal, _the_ MPCP includes processes that measure _the_ range" (2x)
 190/11 "transmits DISCOVERY MPCPDU with timestamp value" -> "transmits a DISCOVERY MPCPDU with a timestamp value" (2x)
 193/12 "of GATE Generation Process and a separate instance of Registration Completion Process" -> "of _the_ GATE Generation Process and a separate instance of _the_ Registration Completion Process"
 195/26 "may only contain PLID, MLID, or ULID, but never GLID" -> "may only contain _a_ PLID, MLID, or ULID, but never _a_ GLID"
 208/49 "registered ONUs using unicast" -> "registered ONUs using a unicast"
 214/43 "transmitting at line rate" -> "transmitting at a line rate"
 214/48 "transmitting at line rate" -> "transmitting at a line rate"
 222/5 "timer counts down time" -> "timer counts down the time"
 227/18 "ONU is capable of receiving DISCOVERY MPCPDU" -> "ONU is capable of receiving a DISCOVERY MPCPDU"
 227/19 "transmitted by the OLT on DISC_PLID" -> "transmitted by the OLT on the DISC_PLID"
 227/27 "ONU skips such discovery attempt" -> "ONU skips such discovery attempts" (add an "s" to attempt)
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Proposed Responses

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

Cl 144 SC 144.1 P180 L21 # 341
 Laubach, Mark Broadcom
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 Bullets have inconsistent endings, one ends in a period, the other doesn't.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Editor to choose how to have consistent (or appropriate) line endings
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Remove "." at the end of the second bullet.

Cl 144 SC 144.1.1.1 P180 L45 # 191
 Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type T Comment Status D
 Hopefully we allocate more than one grant to each ONU
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change
 "allocating a transmission window (grant)" to
 "allocating transmission windows (grants)"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED REJECT.
 OLT allocates one grant to ONU at a time. Using plural here is more confusing and it can be interpreted that one grant is some kind of a fixed unit, and OLT allocates multiple such grants for a single ONU transmission.

Cl 144 SC 144.1.1.2 P181 L24 # 192
 Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D
 This is the only instance of "MAC element"
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change to "MAC instances"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 144 SC 144.1.1.2 P181 L40 # 193
 Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D
 This para implies free use of pre-defined single-copy broadcast for a number of purposes which is incorrect.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change:
 "Several single-copy broadcast logical links are pre-set. Such links may be used to broadcast MPCPDUs, CCPDUs, or OAMPDUs." to:
 "Several single-copy broadcast logical links are pre-defined for specific purposes (see Table 144-1)."
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED REJECT.
 Not clear what the problem is. The current text seems precise and correct.

Cl 144 SC 144.1.1.2 P181 L49 # 194
 Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D
 This statement is extraneous and misleading imho. Most LLID values are not setup by the Discovery Process and those that are not very "dynamic" but rather static.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Strike "Some LLID values are pre-set, while other values are dynamically assigned by the Discovery Process (144.3.5)."
 If the TF believe it is necessary to mention the Discovery Process in this section then change "By default, the OLT is connected" to "By default during the Discovery Process (144.3.5), the OLT is connected"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Ok to strike the sentence, as this is already explained in preceding paragraphs.
 Don't modify the sentence starting with "By default...". Instead, add a new sentence, following it:
 "These two connections per each ONU are established by the Discovery Process (144.3.5)."

Proposed Responses

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

Cl 144 SC 144.1.1.3 P183 L4 # 38
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communications
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D can-vs-may
 "can" used and not intended per Style Guide
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change "newly connected ONU can be scheduled for the upstream transmission" to "newly connected ONU may be scheduled for the upstream transmission"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED REJECT.
 "Can" (i.e., "is able" or "is capable") is correct and is intended. "May" (i.e., "is allowed" or "is permitted") is semantically wrong here

Cl 144 SC 144.1.1.3 P183 L8 # 195
 Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 "registration requests" should be singular
 "details" at line 13 too.
 SuggestedRemedy
 per comment
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 144 SC 144.1.3 P183 L26 # 2
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communications
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 Empty lines
 Similar issue in 144.1.4
 SuggestedRemedy
 Remove the empty lines
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 144 SC 144.1.4.2 P184 L10 # 314
 Lynskey, Eric Broadcom
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 Multiplexor
 SuggestedRemedy
 Multiplexer is used more frequently. Suggest that all instances of multiplexor be changed.
 Page 184 lines 42 and 45. Page 186 line 33. Page 187 line 19 and 30.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 144 SC 144.1.4.2 P184 L45 # 196
 Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D
 "MCI:MA_-
 CONTROL.indication" crosses the line
 SuggestedRemedy
 make non-breaking
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 144 SC 144.1.4.2 P184 L45 # 3
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communications
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 Name of primitive is broken across lines
 SuggestedRemedy
 Make sure primitive names do not break across lines.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Proposed Responses

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

Cl 144 SC 144.1.4.4 P186 L3 # 197
 Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 MCRS already introduced on pg 181
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change:
 "Multi-Channel Reconciliation sublayer (MCRS, see Clause 143)" to
 "MCRS (see Clause 143)"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 See comment #4

Cl 144 SC 144.1.4.4 P186 L4 # 4
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communications
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 MCRS primitibe defined before
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change "sublayer (MCRS, see Clause 143)." to "sublayer (see Clause 143)."
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 144 SC 144.2.1 P186 L27 # 198
 Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D
 Use of the term timestamp is ambiguous:
 187/28 - defined as a variable
 187/30 - something other than (LocalTime?) the variable that is being defined
 187/33 - the variable that is being defined
 187/52 - a non italicized variable
 187/53 - "timestamp value" (which apparently is not the same as the variable)
 188/2 - a field name "Timestamp field"
 191/40 - the value of the variable (or maybe field?) "the Timestamp value pre-compensated"
 192/24 - a field value "the Timestamp field value"
 I could go on;
 there are 29 instances of "Timestamp" most of which (but not all) are in italics (including a lone instance of "Timestamp drift" in DeregistrationTrigger definition),
 there are 29 instances of "timestamp" none of which are in italics (including 11 instance of "timestamp value" and 11 instances of "timestamp drift")
 We can be nicer to the first time reader.
 SuggestedRemedy
 See remain_3ca_2_0719.pdf which shows all changes in marked text (remain_3ca_3_0719 omits change markings).
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED REJECT.
 Yes, as the commenter noticed, these are different things. Capitalization is important. Italics are important. It is ok to use the word "timestamp" in its direct meaning (it is not reserved or prohibited in any way). The proposed changes make the text so much harder to process.

Cl 144 SC 144.2.1 P186 L27 # 5
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communications
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 We usually use the term "forward" to describe the action of delivering frames somewhere else
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change "passing these frames" to "forwarding these frames"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Proposed Responses

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

Cl 144 SC 144.2.1.2 P186 L53 # 199
 Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D
 We should be more specific about which TX & Rx clocks are being referred to here.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change
 "At the OLT the counter shall track the transmit clock, while at the ONU the counter shall track the receive clock." to
 "At the OLT the counter shall track the xMII transmit clock, while at the ONU the counter shall track the xMII receive clock."
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED REJECT.
 There is never 10G transmission by the OLT or 10G reception by the ONU. Why should we say xMII and not 25GMII?

Cl 144 SC 144.2.1.2 P187 L1 # 269
 Kramer, Glen Broadcom
 Comment Type T Comment Status D TBD
 TBD and missing reference
 SuggestedRemedy
 replace with a cross-reference to 142.4.3.1
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 144 SC 144.2.1.2 P187 L1 # 480
 Slavick, Jeff Broadcom
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D TBD
 TBD present for LocalTime reference.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace TBD with pointer to appropriate refernce clause
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 See comment #269

Cl 144 SC 144.2.1.2 P187 L1 # 200
 Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D
 Either this statement is incorrect or the Control Parser Process is incorrect. "In the ONU, this variable is updated with the received timestamp value by the Control Parser Process (see 144.2.1.5)". Note that the ProcessTimestamp only sets the ONUs LocalTime once.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Copy the "// The following line is executed only in the ONU LocalTime = Timestamp;" lines to the end of the else statement in ProcessTimestamp definition (pg 188 line 17).
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED REJECT.
 ... that would break the MPCP operation and is in conflict with the detailed explanation given in 144.3.1.1. No changes needed

Cl 144 SC 144.2.1.2 P187 L1 # 278
 Marris, Arthur Cadence Design Systems
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D TBD
 {TBD reference to Clause 142 needed}
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add appropriate reference
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 See comment #269

Cl 144 SC 144.2.1.2 P187 L1 # 6
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communications
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D TBD
 Missing reference to Clause 142
 SuggestedRemedy
 I do not see any statement which could be referenced to. Strike the whole sentence?
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 See comment #269

Proposed Responses

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

Cl 144 SC 144.2.1.2 P187 L1 # 342
 Laubach, Mark Broadcom
 Comment Type E Comment Status D TBD
 Resolve the red TBD text to cross reference to the appropriate Clause 142 subclause.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Make it so.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 See comment #269

Cl 144 SC 144.2.1.2 P187 L1 # 390
 Dawe, Piers Mellanox
 Comment Type E Comment Status D TBD
 Missing cross-reference
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 See comment #269

Cl 144 SC 144.2.1.2 P187 L1 # 107
 Anslow, Pete Ciena
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D TBD
 "{TBD reference to Clause 142 needed}" is not acceptable content for a draft that is suitable to move to Standards Association ballot.
 SuggestedRemedy
 replace "{TBD reference to Clause 142 needed}" with a suitable reference.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 See comment #269

Cl 144 SC 144.2.1.2 P189 L1 # 298
 Wienckowski, Natalie General Motors
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D TBD
 There is a red highlighted TBD in the document.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change: {TBD reference to Clause 142 needed}
 To: Appropriate subclause in Clause 142.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 See comment #269

Cl 144 SC 144.2.1.3 P187 L1 # 444
 Powell, William Nokia
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D TBD
 Current text:
 "For accuracy of receive clock, see (TBD reference to Clause 142 needed)."
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change to read:
 For accuracy of receive clock, see 142.4.3.1.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 See comment #269

Cl 144 SC 144.2.1.3 P187 L9 # 201
 Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 What is a PLID? The mnemonic has not yet been introduced.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change "PLID" to "Physical Layer ID (PLID)"
 On pg 194 line 45 change "Physical Layer ID (PLID)" to "PLID"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Proposed Responses

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

Cl 144 SC 144.2.1.3 P187 L35 # 202
 Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D
 The reference to T able 31A-1 should not be forest green but rather a live link here and at line 40.
 SuggestedRemedy
 per comment
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 144 SC 144.2.1.5 P188 L48 # 315
 Lyskey, Eric Broadcom
 Comment Type T Comment Status D
 In Figure 144-5, it shows that the first argument passed to MCII is the DA. In 144.1.4.2, it shows the first parameter as being the opcode.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Remove DA from the argument list.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 144 SC 144.3.1 P189 L34 # 203
 Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 "To main purpose of the MPCP" or not "To main purpose of the MPCP" Either way "To" is wrong.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change:
 "To main purpose of the MPCP" to
 "The main purpose of the MPCP"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 144 SC 144.3.1.1 P191 L33 # 343
 Laubach, Mark Broadcom
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 For consistency, statements 1) and 2) need periods at the end of the sentence.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Make it so.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 144 SC 144.3.1.1 P192 L29 # 39
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communications
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D can-vs-may
 "can" used and not intended per Style Guide
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change "This condition can be independently detected" to "This condition may be independently detected"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED REJECT.
 "Can" (i.e., "is able" or "is capable") is correct and is intended. "May" (i.e., "is allowed" or "is permitted") is semantically wrong here

Cl 144 SC 144.3.1.1 P192 L34 # 204
 Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 MLID has not been introduced.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change "MLID" to "Management Link ID (MLID)"
 On pg 195 line 3 change "Management Link ID (MLID) carries" to "The MLID carries"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Proposed Responses

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

Cl 144 SC 144.3.1.1 P192 L37 # 205

Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.

Comment Type T Comment Status D

This requirement is redundant as a properly implemented ProcessTimestamp function ensures that this first large timestamp difference is accommodated.

SuggestedRemedy

Change:
"This large difference is detected immediately after the registration is expected and the ONU shall not recognize it as a timestamp drift error." to
"This large difference that is detected immediately after registration is expected and the ONU does not recognize it as a timestamp drift error (see ProcessTimestamp 144.2.1.4)."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Per comment + strike MP8b PICs + change MP8a to MP8

Cl 144 SC 144.3.1.2 P192 L44 # 206

Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.

Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket

This is the only instance of the word allowances in the draft. We should not indiscriminately use different terms for the same thing.

SuggestedRemedy

change to allocations

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 144 SC 144.3.2 P193 L5 # 344

Laubach, Mark Broadcom

Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket

Only one of the five hyphenated (bulleted) have an ending period. Same for list beginning on page 193, line 52.

SuggestedRemedy

Editor to choose how to have consistent (or appropriate) line endings

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Remove "." at the end of the last sentence.

Cl 144 SC 144.3.2 P193 L12 # 207

Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.

Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket

"as separate instance" should be "a separate instance"

SuggestedRemedy

per comment

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Per comment. Also should be "are created"

Cl 144 SC 144.3.4.1 P194 L46 # 208

Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Are these "TDM-based medium access by the ONUs" something other than GATES? There is no need to introduce new terms here.

SuggestedRemedy

Change:
"such as TDM-based medium access by the ONUs" to
"such as GATE messages"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Comment type changed to "T"

"TDM-based medium access" is an explanation of "Nx25G-EPON operation", not an example, of flows. PLID carries all MPCPDUs, not only GATES.

Rephrase the sentence as follows: "The Physical Layer ID (PLID) carries messages used to control critical Nx25G-EPON operations, such as ONU registrations and arbitration of ONU's access to PON medium."

Proposed Responses

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

Cl 144 SC 144.3.5 P195 L44 # 209
 Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D
 There are duplicate requirements between Table 144-1 and the text of Section 144.3.5. For example registered ONUs accepting BCAST_PLID is specified in Table 144-1 3rd row and on pg 196 line 17.
 SuggestedRemedy
 on pg 196 line 12 change:
 "a registered ONU shall accept all envelopes" to
 "a registered ONU accepts all envelopes"
 Change Table 144-1 as shown in remain_3ca_1_0719.pdf
 Update PICS accordingly.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Implement changes per
http://www.ieee802.org/3/ca/public/meeting_archive/2019/07/kramer_3ca_8_0719.pdf and
http://www.ieee802.org/3/ca/public/meeting_archive/2019/07/kramer_3ca_9_0719.pdf.
 Once changes to text are made, update PICS, removing items LL1a, LL1b, and LL2. Insert new PICS 144.5.4.2 per
http://www.ieee802.org/3/ca/public/meeting_archive/2019/07/hajduczenia_3ca_2_0719.pdf

Cl 144 SC 144.3.5 P196 L14 # 345
 Laubach, Mark Broadcom
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 First list item ends in a ";", the other items have no ending punctuation.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Editor to choose how to have consistent (or appropriate) line endings
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Remove ";

Cl 144 SC 144.3.6 P196 L27 # 210
 Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type T Comment Status D
 There are several disagreements between the text and Figure 144-11.
 The same issues exists on pg 232 / Fig 144-30. and in Cl 144.4.3 pg 232 / Fig 144-30
 SuggestedRemedy
 In text In Figure
 DestinationAddress Destination Address
 SourceAddress Source Address
 OperandList Operand List
 Change Figures to agree with the text (assuming these are considered variables, otherwise it might be easier to change the text)
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 144 SC 144.3.6 P196 L35 # 40
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communications
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D can-vs-may
 "can" used and not intended per Style Guide
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change "For MPCPDUs originating at the OLT, this can be the address of" to "For MPCPDUs originating at the OLT, this may be the address of"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 144 SC 144.3.6.1 P197 L1 # 346
 Laubach, Mark Broadcom
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 Move the page break from before this line to after this paragraph. The preceeding page looks like it is missing information at the bottom of the page.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Editor to choose.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Move the page break from before this line to after this paragraph.

Proposed Responses

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

Cl 144 SC 144.3.6.1 P197 L28 # 41
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communications
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D can-vs-may
 "can" used and not intended per Style Guide
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change "Up to seven envelope allocations can be carried" to "Up to seven envelope allocations may be carried"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED REJECT.
 "Can" (i.e., "is able" or "is capable") is correct and is intended. "May" (i.e., "is allowed" or "is permitted") is semantically wrong here

Cl 144 SC 144.3.6.1 P197 L48 # 211
 Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D
 We seem to have lost the definition of StartTime.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add after ChannelMap description
 "— StartTime:
 This 32-bit unsigned integer value represents the start time of the transmission window (burst), expressed in the units of EQT. The start time is compared to the <|>LocalTime</|>, to correlate the start of the grant."
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Per comment, but StartTime should be in italics. No comma after LocalTime.

Cl 144 SC 144.3.6.1 P198 L20 # 212
 Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type T Comment Status D
 Here we use the phrase "The value of 0 in this field signifies an empty ..." on pg 200 line 10 we use "The value of zero in this field signifies an empty ..." meanwhile we have a good constant defined for this - ESC_PLID.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change both locations to "When this field is set to the value of ESC_PLID then it signifies an empty ..."
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Good catch, and implement per coment but need to add "(see Table 144-1)" after "ESC_PLID"
 Question to discuss - why the ESC_PLID is PLID? Should it just be ESC_LLID?

Cl 144 SC 144.3.6.2 P199 L40 # 42
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communications
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D can-vs-may
 "can" used and not intended per Style Guide
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change "Up to seven LLIDs can be reported by a single" to "Up to seven LLIDs may be reported by a single"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED REJECT.
 "Can" (i.e., "is able" or "is capable") is correct and is intended. "May" (i.e., "is allowed" or "is permitted") is semantically wrong here

Proposed Responses

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

Cl 144 SC 144.3.6.2 P199 L47 # 213

Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

The description for the timestamp field is repeated 7x. We don't do this for other variable definitions

- 197/36
- 199/47
- 201/13
- 203/4
- 204/41
- 206/4
- 209/1

Similar situation exist for other fields.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the description for all but the first instance of this field (pg 197 line 36). Note that the first instance of this is generic and does not mention OLT or ONU (which is good). Add a cross reference to the first definition instance "See 144.3.6.1" (with a live link of course).

Do the same for the following field def's (pg/line fieldname xRef):

- 200/9 LLID "See 144.3.6.1"
- 206/9 ChannelMap "See 144.3.6.1"
- 207/38 SP1Length "See 144.3.6.4"
- 207/42 SP2Length "See 144.3.6.4"
- 207/46 SP3Length "See 144.3.6.4"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

Comment type changed to "T"

- Definitions of ChannelMap are different for GATE and DISCOVERY MPCPDUs
- Definitions of timestamp should be corrected and will therefore be different.
- Definitions of LLID are different for GATE and REPORT MPCPDUs
- Definitions of SPnLength are different in DISCOVERY and REGISTER MPCPDUs

Timestamps in GATEs are not the same as the content of MPCP Local time counter. Each timestamp is pre-compensated by the RTT value of the destination ONU.

Cl 144 SC 144.3.6.2 P200 L2 # 214

Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.

Comment Type T Comment Status D

We should make it clear that GLIDs are not included in the NonEmptyQueues count.

SuggestedRemedy

After "The number of LLIDs" add " (PLID, MLID, and ULIDs)"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

Comment type changed to "T"

Discussion needed at the meeting.

Cl 144 SC 144.3.6.3 P201 L6 # 215

Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.

Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket

The variable name Timestamp should not cross the line

SuggestedRemedy

per comment

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 144 SC 144.3.6.3 P201 L22 # 347

Laubach, Mark Broadcom

Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket

In tables in this subclause, there should be some consistency on whether to use a period at the end of an item in the Comment column. For example, in some cases "Ignored on reception" has an ending period, in other tables, it does not. Suggest being consistent across this subclause for those table Comments that read like a statement.

SuggestedRemedy

Editor to choose how to have consistent (or appropriate) line endings

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Remove periods within tables when a non-complete sentence is used.

Proposed Responses

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

Cl 144 SC 144.3.6.3 P201 L31 # 216

Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D
 PendingEnvelopes is an 8-bit value in the text but a 16 bit field in Fig 144-14 whereas EchoPendingEnvelopes is only 8-bits in both text and fig 144-15 (pg 203/204), At the very lease these should agree. Should we consider increasing the maximum size of PendingEnvelopes? This seemed like a reasonable size 10 years ago for pending grants but maybe not now.

SuggestedRemedy
 Increase the size of these to a 10 bits. (4 x larger)
 Likewise increase size of EchoPendingEnvelopes on pg 203 line 33 and in Figure 144-15 (adjust Pad to 27 also).

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Some time ago, we made a decision to increase this field to 16 bits. Previously, we were showing PendingGrants, but now we show PendingEnvelopes and there can be hundreds of envelopes per each grant. The change to 16 bits needs to be propagated to all places (to be discussed at the meeting).

Cl 144 SC 144.3.6.3 P202 L22 # 458

Nicholl, Shawn Xilinx
 Comment Type E Comment Status D
 In "Figure 144-14 - REGISTER_REQ MPCPDU" unexpected use of hyphen. Contrast with "Figure 103-26 - REGISTER_REQ MPCPDU" in existing 802.3-2018 which shows "Length/Type = 0x8808" and "Opcode = 0x0004". There are other figures in the document with unexpected hyphen (eg. Figure 144-30, 144-31, 144-32).

SuggestedRemedy
 Remove the hyphen from the figures.

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED REJECT.

Consistent with previous EPON clause definitions, see Clause 64, 77

Cl 144 SC 144.3.6.4 P202 L49 # 217

Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 Is "destination address" the same as "Destination Address" and "DestinationAddress"?

SuggestedRemedy
 replace with "DestinationAddress"

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 144 SC 144.3.6.4 P203 L11 # 218

Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 PLID has already been introduced.

SuggestedRemedy
 Change
 "physical layer identifier (PLID, see 144.3.4.1)" to
 "PLID (see 144.3.4.1)"

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 144 SC 144.3.6.4 P203 L14 # 219

Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 MLID has already been introduced.

SuggestedRemedy
 Change:
 "management link identifier (MLID, see 144.3.4.2)" to
 "MLID, (see 144.3.4.2)"

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Proposed Responses

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

Cl 144 SC 144.3.6.5 P204 L39 # 108
 Anslow, Pete Ciena
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 "Figure 144-14" should be a cross-reference.
 Likewise for "Figure 144-16" on page 208, line 52
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change "Figure 144-14" and "Figure 144-16" on page 208, line 52 to be cross-references.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 144 SC 144.3.6.6 P206 L17 # 220
 Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type T Comment Status D
 Elsewhere (ex. when assigning timestamp) we use LocalTime not local clock. It would be better if we were consistent.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change "the local clock" to "LocalTime" (in italics)
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 144 SC 144.3.6.6 P206 L40 # 43
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communications
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D can-vs-may
 "can" used and not intended per Style Guide
 SuggestedRemedy
 In table 144-7, change all instance of "OLT cannot receive" to "OLT is not capable of receiving" and "OLT can receive" to "OLT is capable of receiving"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 144 SC 144.3.6.6 P207 L19 # 221
 Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 Improper left margin. Reset para style to T,text
 SuggestedRemedy
 per comment
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 144 SC 144.3.6.6 P207 L20 # 325
 Lynskey, Eric Broadcom
 Comment Type T Comment Status D
 The draft makes it very clear how the ONU should react when an OLT advertises multiple speeds during a discovery attempt. There is no description of how the ONU should handle a case when multiple coexistence types are advertised. It can be left to the ONU to decide.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Remove the second two sentences of the paragraph and replace with: The OLT MPMC client may allow a concurrent registration of ONUs with different rates by setting both bits 5 and 6 to 1. The processing of DiscoveryInfo flags by the ONU and the ONU behavior in dual-rate systems is further specified in 144.3.9. The OLT MPMC client may also allow a concurrent registration of ONUs with different coexistence options by setting both bits 14 and 15 to 1. For ONUs that support both coexistence types, the choice of which type to attempt to register is implementation dependent.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Minor editorial tweaks

Remove the second two sentences of the paragraph and replace with: The OLT MPMC client may allow a concurrent registration of ONUs with different rates by setting both bits 5 and 6 to 1. The processing of DiscoveryInfo flags by the ONU and the ONU behavior in dual-rate systems is further specified in 144.3.9. The OLT MPMC client may also allow a concurrent registration of ONUs with different coexistence options by setting both bits 14 and 15 to 1. For ONUs that support both coexistence types, the choice of which type to attempt to register is implementation-dependent.

Proposed Responses

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

Cl 144 SC 144.3.6.7 P208 L42 # 222

Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

This statement is misleading "Generally, the SYNC_PATTERN MPCPDUs are transmitted in envelopes with the LLID equal to DISC_PLID (see 144.3.5)." as it may not be the general case but does describe a required case for unregistered ONUs. Subsequent statement in this section contradicts the "Generally" phrasing.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the statement as follows:
 "The SYNC_PATTERN MPCPDUs are transmitted in envelopes with the LLID equal to DISC_PLID (see 144.3.5) to allow unregistered ONUs to obtain the synchronization pattern."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

The intention was to say that, in most common scenarios, the SYNC_PATTERN MPCPDUs are transmitted on DISC_PLID. There may be situation where they also (i.e., additionally) are transmitted on unicast PLIDs. Need to discuss the text with proposed updates and make sure it is correctly reflecting that intent.

Cl 144 SC 144.3.6.7 P208 L52 # 348

Laubach, Mark Broadcom

Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket

"Figure 144-16" needs to be a proper cross reference.

SuggestedRemedy

Make it so.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 144 SC 144.3.7 P210 L34 # 299

Wienckowski, Natalie General Motors

Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket

There is a reference to a place in this document that is red text and does not have a hyperlink.

SuggestedRemedy

Change 141.1.3 to a Cross-Reference.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #223

Cl 144 SC 144.3.7 P210 L34 # 7

Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communications

Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket

Reference in red?

SuggestedRemedy

Change to 142.1.3 and make it live

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 144 SC 144.3.7 P210 L34 # 223

Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.

Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket

Why is this a ref to 143.1.3 and in red font?

SuggestedRemedy

make this a live link to 142.1.3

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 144 SC 144.3.7 P210 L34 # 349

Laubach, Mark Broadcom

Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket

Turn "143.1.3" into a proper cross reference or remove the Red text.

SuggestedRemedy

Make it so.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Proposed Responses

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

Cl 144 SC 144.3.7 P210 L34 # 274
 Marris, Arthur Cadence Design Systems
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 Fix cross reference (see 143.1.3)
 SuggestedRemedy
 Fix cross reference (see 143.1.3)
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 See comment #223

Cl 144 SC 144.3.7 P210 L38 # 224
 Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type T Comment Status D
 We should be clear that the Discovery process is aborted only if a SYNC_PATTERN is receive for the DISC_PLID.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change:
 "If a SYNC_PATTERN MPCPDU is received ..." to
 "If a SYNC_PATTERN MPCPDU directed to the DISC_PLID is received ..."
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Changes per comment. Also implement changes per
http://www.ieee802.org/3/ca/public/meeting_archive/2019/07/kramer_3ca_7_0719.pdf

Cl 144 SC 144.3.7 P210 L46 # 8
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communications
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 Compound adjective "16 bit wide"
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change to "16-bit wide"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 144 SC 144.3.7 P210 L50 # 225
 Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type E Comment Status D
 This is the only instance of the term off-line. It is easier on the reader if we are consistent in our use of terms. Unregistered is used at least 22 times, newly connected is use 3x.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace with "Off-line" and "newly connected" with "unregistered". Note that on pg 210 line 26 just strike "newly connected or".
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED REJECT.

What is the reson to restrict our vocabulary? Not every new word needs a definition. "off-line" or "newly-connected" is self-explanatory and make this text clearer.

Cl 144 SC 144.3.7 P211 L1 # 303
 Kramer, Glen Broadcom
 Comment Type T Comment Status D
 "Each ONU waits a random amount of time before transmitting the REGISTER_REQ MPCPDU that is shorter than the length of the discovery window."
 A very confusing sentence. What is shorter then the discovery window, the REGISTER_REQ MPCPDU or the random amount of time?
 SuggestedRemedy
 Split this into two sentences:
 "Each ONU waits a random amount of time before transmitting the REGISTER_REQ MPCPDU. The wait time together with the REGISTER_REQ MPCPDU transmission time (including optical overhead, burst synchronization sequence, and FEC paity data) do not exceed the length of the discovery window."
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Proposed Responses

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

Cl 144 SC 144.3.7 P211 L3 # 9 [REDACTED]
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communications
 Comment Type E Comment Status D can-vs-may
 Can versus may
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change "REGISTER_REQ MPCPDUs can be received by the OLT" to "REGISTER_REQ MPCPDUs may be received by the OLT"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED REJECT.
 "Can" (i.e., "is able" or "is capable") is correct and is intended. "May" (i.e., "is allowed" or "is permitted") is semantically wrong here.

Cl 144 SC 144.3.7 P211 L3 # 44 [REDACTED]
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communications
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D can-vs-may
 "can" used and not intended per Style Guide
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change "valid REGISTER_REQ MPCPDUs can be received" to "valid REGISTER_REQ MPCPDUs may be received"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 144 SC 144.3.7 P211 L9 # 226 [REDACTED]
 Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D
 It is not clear to me why we expect the ONU to lie to the OLT as implied by this statement "Note that even though a compliant ONU is not prohibited from supporting more than one data rate in any transmission channel, it is expected that a single supported data rate for upstream and downstream channel is indicated in the RegisterRequestInfo field."
 While I agree that an ONU should only attempt to register at a single rate it should advertise it's capabilities truthfully.
 The description of the information in the RegisterRequestInfo seems to begin with "Included in the REGISTER_REQ MPCPDU is the ONU's MAC address and ..." at line 3, which would make a better para break than this misguided note.

SuggestedRemedy
 Start a new para beginning at line 3 "Included in the REGISTER_REQ MPCPDU is the ONU's MAC address and ..." and combine with the para starting "Note even thought ..."
 Change:
 "Note that even though a compliant ONU is not prohibited from supporting more than one data rate in any transmission channel, it is expected that a single supported data rate for upstream and downstream channel is indicated in the RegisterRequestInfo field." to "Note that even though a compliant ONU is not prohibited from supporting more than one data rate in any transmission channel, it is expected that an ONU only attempt to register at a single rate as indicated in the RegisterRequestInfo field bits 5 and 6."

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Good Catch. Additionally, in the sentence "Additionally, a registering ONU notifies the OLT of its transmission capabilities in the upstream and downstream channels by setting appropriately the flags in the RegisterRequestInfo field, as specified in 144.3.6.3.", replace "in the upstream and downstream channels" with "in the current upstream channel"

The RegisterRequestInfo only reports the channel on which REGISTER_REQ MPCPDU is transmitted.

Cl 144 SC 144.3.7 P211 L13 # 10 [REDACTED]
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communications
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 Wrong field names
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change "the Laser On Time and Laser Off Time fields." to "the <i>LaserOnTime</i> and <i>LaserOffTime</i> fields." - make sure names are italicized
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Proposed Responses

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

Cl 144 SC 144.3.7 P211 L26 # 45
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communications
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D can-vs-may
 "can" used and not intended per Style Guide
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change "the ONU is registered and normal message traffic can begin" to "the ONU is registered and normal message traffic may begin"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 144 SC 144.3.7 P211 L32 # 46
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communications
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D can-vs-may
 "can" used and not intended per Style Guide
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change "The ONU can then reregister" to "The ONU may then reregister"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 144 SC 144.3.7 P211 L33 # 324
 Lynskey, Eric Broadcom
 Comment Type T Comment Status D
 Reregister and Deregister are not valid flags.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change to, "...REGISTER_MPCPDU may indicate a value, NACK, that if specified forces the receiving ONU into reregistering." In the next sentence, change to "...REGISTER_REQ MPCPDU contains the NACK bit..."
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 144 SC 144.3.7.1 P213 L14 # 351
 Laubach, Mark Broadcom
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 The "u" in "us" is not a symbol.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Should be the proper mu symbol.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 144 SC 144.3.7.3 P213 L38 # 227
 Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type T Comment Status D
 The description of ChState does not sound like an integer.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change type to "8-bit Boolean array"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Change to "Array of eight boolean values"

Cl 144 SC 144.3.7.3 P213 L51 # 11
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communications
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D
 Undefined variables / constants? MissedReportCount, MISSED_REPORT_LIMIT
 SuggestedRemedy
 Need to be added and defined
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED REJECT.
 No proposal included, discussion needed?

Proposed Responses

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

Cl 144 SC 144.3.7.3 P214 L4 # 317

Lynskey, Eric Broadcom

Comment Type T Comment Status D

There is no way for the ONU to send a register ack once it has been registered. Figure 144-22 shows that the ONU can only send a register request once it has reached the REGISTERED state. Once the REGISTERED state in Figure 144-21 has been reached, only the other conditions (1, 2, 4) are expected.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace MsgRegisterAck with MsgRegisterReq in two places. Also replace Deregister with NACK.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 144 SC 144.3.7.3 P214 L7 # 323

Lynskey, Eric Broadcom

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Deregister is not a valid flag.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to NACK.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 144 SC 144.3.7.3 P214 L9 # 228

Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.

Comment Type T Comment Status D

The description of GrantEndTime does sound like an integer.

SuggestedRemedy

Change type to "32-bit unsigned integer"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 144 SC 144.3.7.3 P214 L36 # 229

Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.

Comment Type T Comment Status D

The description of MaxDelay does sound like an integer.

SuggestedRemedy

Change type to "32-bit unsigned integer"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 144 SC 144.3.7.3 P214 L37 # 47

Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communications

Comment Type ER Comment Status D can-vs-may

"can" used and not intended per Style Guide

SuggestedRemedy

Change "the maximum delay the ONU can apply to" to "the maximum delay the ONU may apply to"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 144 SC 144.3.7.3 P214 L44 # 391

Dawe, Piers Mellanox

Comment Type T Comment Status D

10.3125 Gb/s

SuggestedRemedy

10.3125 GBd. Also 25.78125 Gb/s -> GBd

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Proposed Responses

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

Cl 144 SC 144.3.7.3 P214 L49 # 300
 Wienckowski, Natalie General Motors
 Comment Type E Comment Status D
 Missing non-breaking spaces in number that have 4 or more digits to the right of the decimal per 13.3.2 of the 2014 IEEE-SA Style Manual.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change: 25.78125
 To: 25.781 25
 Proposed Response Response Status Z
 PROPOSED REJECT.
 This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

Cl 144 SC 144.3.7.3 P215 L1 # 48
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communications
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D can-vs-may
 "can" used and not intended per Style Guide
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change "this variable can take the following values" to "this variable takes the following values"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 144 SC 144.3.7.3 P215 L21 # 230
 Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D
 This definition of RegAllowed disallows an ONU capable of both 10 & 25 G rates from registering with an OLT that is also capable of both 10 & 25G rates at the 10G rate. There may be good reasons that we haven't thought of that would make such behavior beneficial. There are several solutions:
 1) add a bit for 10G Discovery Window for single rate ONUs only.
 2) add a note indicating that the OLT may lie to the ONU regarding capabilities to force registration at 10G rate.
 SuggestedRemedy
 I would prefer option 1.
 Reflect any changes in 144.3.9 also
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED REJECT.
 To allow ONU deterministic behavior, ONU is required to register at the highest rate supported by both the OLT and this ONU.
 The OLT doesn't lie to the ONU. It can choose what capability to advertize (see 144.3.9)
 To force 10G- and 25G-capable ONUs to register at 10G, the OLT "temporarily disables" its 25G receive capability, so option 2 is employed. This is the same method that is employed with 10G and 1G capable ONUs in 802.3av.
 No changes required.

Cl 144 SC 144.3.7.3 P215 L45 # 231
 Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type T Comment Status D
 The description of RegStart does sound like an integer.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change type to "32-bit unsigned integer"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Proposed Responses

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

Cl 144 SC 144.3.7.3 P215 L53 # 232
 Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type T Comment Status D
 The description of SpSeq does sound like an integer.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change type to "32-bit unsigned integer"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 144 SC 144.3.7.4 P216 L12 # 352
 Laubach, Mark Broadcom
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 Of the items in the a) to f) list, one ends in a period, the rest do not. Use consistent line endings.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Editor to choose how to have consistent (or appropriate) line endings
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Remove "." at the end of bullet items

Cl 144 SC 144.3.7.5 P216 L48 # 233
 Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D
 No variable name MsgRegsiter is used. Maybe should be MsgRegister?
 SuggestedRemedy
 per comment
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 144 SC 144.3.7.8 P218 L36 # 234
 Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 "Registered" should be in italics
 SuggestedRemedy
 per comment
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Two instances
 Cl 144 SC 144.3.7.8 P219 L9 # 235
 Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D
 In valid symbol in exit criteria from WAIT_FOR_SYNC "msgSyndPattern.Index >>?<<
 SpSeq
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace "?" with less than or equal to symbol
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 Replace "?" with b"!=" (not equal)

Cl 144 SC 144.3.7.8 P219 L9 # 12
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communications
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D
 Wrong symbol in line: "?"
 SuggestedRemedy
 Likely it is supposed to be "!="
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Proposed Responses

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

Cl 144 SC 144.3.7.8 P219 L36 # 353
 Laubach, Mark Broadcom
 Comment Type T Comment Status D
 In Figure 144-22, is there a blank line in the middle of the steps in COMMIT_DISC_ENV or is something technical missing?
 SuggestedRemedy
 Verify if something missing, and if so fix it. If it is indeed a blank line consider removing.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Remove the blank line

Cl 144 SC 144.3.7.8 P219 L49 # 316
 Lynskey, Eric Broadcom
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 In Figure 144-22, timestampDrift should be capitalized.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change to TimestampDrift.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 144 SC 144.3.8 P220 L3 # 236
 Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 see 1.4.278 should be a live link
 SuggestedRemedy
 per comment
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 144 SC 144.3.8 P220 L8 # 237
 Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type T Comment Status D
 It would be useful to the reader to refer back to Figure 144-3 & 144-4.
 SuggestedRemedy
 At the end of the first para add: "The following description of the granting process makes use of the interfaces and functional blocks found in Figure 144-3 and Figure 144-4."
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 Comment type changed to "T"

Cl 144 SC 144.3.8.1 P220 L36 # 238
 Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type T Comment Status D
 The description of MPCP_PROCESS_DLY and GATE_TIMEOUT does sound like an integer.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change type to "32-bit unsigned integer"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 144 SC 144.3.8.1 P220 L40 # 301
 Wienckowski, Natalie General Motors
 Comment Type E Comment Status D
 Use a non-breaking space in number that have 4 or more digits to the left of the decimal per 13.3.2 of the 2014 IEEE-SA Style Manual, not a comma.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change: 6,400
 To: 6 400 or 6400 as 4 digit numbers don't have to have the space unless they are in a column with larger numbers.
 Proposed Response Response Status Z
 PROPOSED REJECT.
 This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

Proposed Responses

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

Cl 144 SC 144.3.8.1 P220 L47 # 302
 Wienckowski, Natalie General Motors
 Comment Type E Comment Status D
 Use a non-breaking space in number that have 4 or more digits to the left of the decimal per 13.3.2 of the 2014 IEEE-SA Style Manual, not a comma.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change: 19,531,250
 To: 19 531 250
 Proposed Response Response Status Z
 PROPOSED REJECT.
 This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

Cl 144 SC 144.3.8.1 P220 L47 # 239
 Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D
 Assuming GATE_TIMEOUT really is a constant as implied then 50 ms is not the default value, it is the only allowed value.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Strike ", default value"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 144 SC 144.3.8.3 P221 L4 # 240
 Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type T Comment Status D
 This variable is stated as a Boolean array and it is confusing to refer to it as "A Boolean that represents"
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change:
 "A Boolean that represents" to
 "Each element in this Boolean array represents"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Use this text:
 "Each element of this array is associated with the respective MCRS channel and represents whether..."
 Strike the last sentence

Cl 144 SC 144.3.8.3 P221 L22 # 241
 Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type T Comment Status D
 In all other variable definitions we give the size of the variable or field, we should here also.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change ass follows:
 "LLID: LLID" -> "LLID: the 16-bit LLID"
 StartTime: Start time" -> "StartTime: the 32-bit start time"
 "Length: The length" -> "Length: the 22-bit length"
 observe proper italics format.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 144 SC 144.3.8.6 P222 L22 # 305
 Kramer, Glen Broadcom
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 "An array 16-bit elements" is missing "of"
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change to "An array of 16-bit elements"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Proposed Responses

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

Cl 144 SC 144.3.8.7 P222 L33 # 242
 Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D
 Given only one requirement maps to this clause there should ideally be only one shall statement.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change:
 "The OLT shall implement the GATE Generation state diagram as shown in Figure 144–23. A separate instance of the state diagram shall be implemented per each registered ONU (PLID)." to
 "The OLT shall implement a separate instance for each registered ONU (PLID) of the GATE Generation state diagram as shown in Figure 144–23."
 No change to PICS needed.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED REJECT.
 The existing text reads better. No changes needed.

Cl 144 SC 144.3.8.8 P223 L40 # 244
 Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D
 There does not appear to be any field defined as MsgGate.ChMap
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change to MsgGate.ChannelMap (2x in this SD) as used elsewhere and defined in 144.3.6.1.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 144 SC 144.3.8.8 P223 L40 # 243
 Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D
 Ampersand as an operator is not included in our list of conventions.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Use "AND"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 144 SC 144.3.8.11 P226 L8 # 13
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communications
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D
 Undefined primitive: MPRS_CTRL?
 SuggestedRemedy
 Is MCRS_CTRL intended?
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 144 SC 144.3.9.1 P227 L6 # 14
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communications
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 Table 144–9 has very inconsistent line width
 SuggestedRemedy
 Align with standard for 802.3 drafts
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 144 SC 144.3.9.1 P227 L10 # 245
 Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 Allowing
 15G-EP and 50G-EP
 ON ON
 to cross the line is confusing.
 SuggestedRemedy
 ensure "EPON" appears on a single line
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Proposed Responses

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

Cl 144 SC 144.4.2 P229 L28 # 246
 Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type T Comment Status D
 Shouldn't this be the "CCP Client" not the "MPMC Client" (at least per Figure 144-3, 4, 28 & 29)? This seems to be a common error throughout 144.4 however there also appear to be a few cases where MPCP Client is correct. Below is a list of suspect uses (pg/line & quote.
 229/35 local MPMC Client,
 229/37 OLT MPMC Client,
 229/46 local MPMC Client,
 230/17 MPMC Client initiates,
 230/34 MPMC Client initiates,
 231/3 MPMC Client initiates,
 231/24 MPMC Client initiates,
 231/37 MPMC Client may monitor,
 231/39 MPMC Client may (this instance may be OK check carefully),
 231/41 notify the MPMC Client,
 231/44 the MPMC Client at the ONU.
 238/25 MPMC Client and is processed

SuggestedRemedy

per comment
 We could consider just changing the four figures as that would be less invasive than what is suggested in this comment. Note that CCP Client does not appear in the draft at this time (including top level layering diagrams such as 144-2).

Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

This will require TF discussion. Generally, a client includes the name of a sublayer of which it is a client (we also use MAC Client and PMA Client). So, "MPMC Client" is correct for a client of Multi-Point MAC Control sublayer. Everywhere in text we use "MPMC Client" and never "MPCP Client" or "CCP Client". However, a few pictures label the boxes "MPCP Client" and "CCP Client". If we decide to reconcile these differences we can do one of two things:

- 1) Replace 36 occurrences of "MPMC Client" with either "MPCP Client " or "CCP Client"
- 2) In Figures 144-3, -4, -10, -11, -28, -29, replace "MPCP Client" with "MPMC Client (MPCP)" and "CCP Client" with "MPMC Client (CCP)"

Cl 144 SC 144.4.2 P229 L44 # 247
 Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type T Comment Status D
 Add clarification to the statement "Any non-persistent changes are reverted upon ONU reset and re-registration."
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add to the end of the sentence "(i.e., the channel reverts to it's default state)"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Add to the end of the sentence "(i.e., the channel reverts to its default state)"
 Change: "it's" to "its"

Cl 144 SC 144.4.2 P230 L1 # 248
 Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 Does one have to change both US & DS? Seems a bit onerous to me.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change:
 "enabling / disabling one of downstream and upstream channels" to
 "enabling / disabling one of the downstream or upstream channels"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Proposed Responses

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

Cl 144 SC 144.4.2.1 P230 L4 # 249

Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

What prevents the OLT from persistently disabling the only DS channel an ONU has available and thereby breaking the ONU?

SuggestedRemedy

Add at the end of the para "The OLT shall not disable a downstream channel at the ONU if it is the single remaining enabled channel at that ONT"
Update PICS.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

This would be a requirement to the MPMC Client (CCP), which is outside the scope of the standard. In general, we should not limit device capabilities, because an operator may make a mistake. Sometimes it may be necessary to disable all channels and brick the ONU in order to preserve the rest of EPON. NMS user interface usually have sufficient guards in place to prevent accidental msiconfiguration.

Cl 144 SC 144.4.2.1 P230 L13 # 319

Lynskey, Eric Broadcom

Comment Type T Comment Status D

It says in 144.1.4.1 that the definition and behavior of the MPMC Client is outside the scope of this standard. There is quite a bit of text in 144.4.2.1, 144.4.2.2, 144.4.2.3, and 144.4.2.4 that seems to describe the behavior of the MPMC Client. Specifically, there is text that says when the OLT starts and stops granting the ONU. A lot of the text in these subclauses is duplicated and not necessary.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove all text in 144.4.2.1 starting with page 230 line 13. Remove all text in 144.4.2.2 starting with page 230 line 32. Remove all text in 144.4.2.3 starting with page 231 line 1. Remove all text in 144.4.2.4 starting with page 231 line 22.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

This text is intended to be informative only. There are no requirements made.

Cl 144 SC 144.4.2.1 P230 L19 # 318

Lynskey, Eric Broadcom

Comment Type T Comment Status D

ccp_timer and CCP_RETRY_LIMIT not defined.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove steps i and ii in four places: 144.4.2.1, 144.4.2.2, 144.4.2.3, and 144.4.2.4.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 144 SC 144.4.2.5 P231 L38 # 250

Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.

Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket

Grammar typo

SuggestedRemedy

change:
"allowing the ONU notify the OLT" to
"allowing the ONU to notify the OLT"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 144 SC 144.4.2.5 P231 L41 # 320

Lynskey, Eric Broadcom

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Behavior of MPMC Client.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove all text in 144.4.2.5 beginning with line 41. Replace with: To notify the MPMC Client at the OLT about a local channel state change, the MPMC Client at the ONU may send an unsolicited CC_RESPONSE CCPDU to the OLT, indicating the new state of all of its downstream and upstream channels.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

This text is intended to be informative only. There are no requirements made.

Proposed Responses

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

Cl 144 SC 144.4.3 P232 L7 # 49

Hajduczenia, Marek

Charter Communications

Comment Type ER Comment Status D can-vs-may

"can" used and not intended per Style Guide

SuggestedRemedy

Change "For CCPDUs originating at the OLT, this can be the" to "For CCPDUs originating at the OLT, this may be the"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Page was wrong (233) and fixed (232)

Cl 144 SC 144.4.3 P232 L16 # 251

Remein, Duane

Futurewei Technologies, Inc.

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Figure 144-30 does not include an "OperandList" as indicated by this text.

SuggestedRemedy

In Figure 144-30 change "Data/Reserved" to "OperandList/Reserved"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Add additional field "OperandList"
Rename "Data/Reserved/Pad" into "Pad" (as it is done in Figure 144-11)

Cl 144 SC 144.4.3.1 P233 L9 # 252

Remein, Duane

Futurewei Technologies, Inc.

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

Opcode in Figures 144-31 & 32 do not agree with the text.

SuggestedRemedy

Align figures and text; CC_REQUEST should use Opcode 20 and CC_RESPONSE Opcode 21 (text is correct).

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Opcodes are correct. The figures are wrong. 144-31 shows CC_RESPONSE instead of CC_REQUEST and 144-32 shows the opposite. Use correct figures.

Cl 144 SC 144.4.3.1 P233 L21 # 321

Lynskey, Eric

Broadcom

Comment Type T Comment Status D

If the intent is to reserve space for support of up to 16 channels in the future, the space in the frame should be reserved for both downstream and upstream status.

SuggestedRemedy

In Figure 144-31, add 14 octets of Reserved following StatusUC1. Adjust the pad.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 144 SC 144.4.3.1 P234 L14 # 253

Remein, Duane

Futurewei Technologies, Inc.

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

What prevents the "previous persistent state" for one channel combined with "previous persistent state" for another change from creating an ONU with all channels disabled and thereby appear to be broken?

SuggestedRemedy

Add footnote to PersistenceFlag = 1

1 The ONU shall refuse any instruction that would result in persistently disabling all channels in a given direction.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

ONU shall never refuse a command from the OLT (NMS), no matter what the consequences to the ONU are. Any limitations, if needed, should be placed on the NMS, not on the ONU.

Cl 144 SC 144.4.3.2 P234 L42 # 322

Lynskey, Eric

Broadcom

Comment Type T Comment Status D

If the intent is to reserve space for support of up to 16 channels in the future, the space in the frame should be reserved for both downstream and upstream actions.

SuggestedRemedy

In Figure 144-32, add 14 octets of Reserved following ActionUC1. Adjust the pad.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Proposed Responses

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

Cl 144 SC 144.4.4.1 P236 L11 # 15
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communications
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D
 Wrong table reference in CH_STATE_ABSENT, CH_STATE_DISABLED_REMOTE, CH_STATE_ENABLED.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change Table 144-11. to Table 144-12.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 144 SC 144.4.4.4 P238 L23 # 50
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communications
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D can-vs-may
 "can" used and not intended per Style Guide
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change "(array element) can be accessed" to "(array element) is accessed"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 144 SC 144.5.4.4 P242 L53 # 354
 Laubach, Mark Broadcom
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket
 Tables in the PICS need bottom ruling enabled.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Make it so.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 149 SC 149.1.3 P71 L27 # 476
 Brandt, David Rockwell Automation
 Comment Type E Comment Status D wrong-ballot
 PCS layer label is inconsistent with Figure 44-1 and Figure 125-1.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change: "RS-FEC PCS"
 To: "64B/65B RS-FEC PCS"
 Proposed Response Response Status Z
 PROPOSED REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

I do not think this draft includes clause 149. Wrong project?

Cl 149 SC 149.1.3.1 P72 L38 # 479
 Brandt, David Rockwell Automation
 Comment Type E Comment Status D wrong-ballot
 Missing dashes.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change: "3260 bit block"
 To: "3260-bit block", in 2 locations
 Proposed Response Response Status Z
 PROPOSED REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

I do not think this draft includes clause 149. Wrong project?

Proposed Responses

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

Cl 149 SC 149.3.2.2.4 P89 L24 # 468
 Brandt, David Rockwell Automation
 Comment Type E Comment Status D wrong-ballot
 Figure 149-6 lacks arrow ends on TXD<32> and TXD<63>.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Add arrow ends on TXD<32> and TXD<63>.
 Proposed Response Response Status Z
 PROPOSED REJECT.
 This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

I do not think this draft includes clause 149. Wrong project?

Cl 149 SC 149.3.9 P120 L20 # 477
 Brandt, David Rockwell Automation
 Comment Type E Comment Status D wrong-ballot
 Missing space
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change: "OAM10-bit"
 To: "OAM 10-bit"
 Proposed Response Response Status Z
 PROPOSED REJECT.
 This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

I do not think this draft includes clause 149. Wrong project?

Cl 149 SC 149.3.9.3 P128 L1 # 478
 Brandt, David Rockwell Automation
 Comment Type E Comment Status D wrong-ballot
 Should this refer to the "State Variables to OAM Register Mapping" that were edited in Clause 97 to be BASE-T1? Why do they need to appear twice?
 SuggestedRemedy
 Refer to the modified Clause 97 Table 97-6 for the BASE-T1 mappings and then define the additional mappings for MultiGBASE-T1.
 Proposed Response Response Status Z
 PROPOSED REJECT.
 This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

I do not think this draft includes clause 149. Wrong project?

Cl 149 SC 149.5.3.1 P160 L11 # 469
 Brandt, David Rockwell Automation
 Comment Type T Comment Status D wrong-ballot
 I don't see where the frame error ratio comes from. If I assume this is actual MAC data with addresses and FCS, I get FER = 1e-12 * (800 + 22) * 8 = 6.6e-9. I note that 149.5.3.2 does not add any MAC frame overhead.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Please check the math or describe better.
 Proposed Response Response Status Z
 PROPOSED REJECT.
 This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

I do not think this draft includes clause 149. Wrong project?

Proposed Responses

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

Cl 149 SC 149.5.3.2 P160 L20 # 470

Brandt, David Rockwell Automation
 Comment Type T Comment Status D wrong-ballot

149.5.3.1 seem inconsistenmt. 149.5.3.1 has "frame error ratio", but wouldn't these frames crossing XGMII also be counted as 149.5.3.2 "frame loss ratio" when they get to the MAC? There should be no further correction after RS-FEC. Both use the same link segment specified in 149.7.

SuggestedRemedy

Consider whether the same terminology, packet sizes and measurement points can be used.

Proposed Response Response Status Z

PROPOSED REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

I do not think this draft includes clause 149. Wrong project?

Cl 149 SC 149.9.2.2 P169 L41 # 471

Brandt, David Rockwell Automation
 Comment Type T Comment Status D wrong-ballot

This paragraph has 2 shalls that apply to entire products. The seems out of our scope.

SuggestedRemedy

Suggest the "shalls" be replaced with text in the spirit of the last sentence of the paragraph.
 Change1st: "shall", To: "is expected be able to"
 Change 2nd: "shall be tested", To: "is expected to allow products to be tested"
 Delete: ES4 and ES5.

Proposed Response Response Status Z

PROPOSED REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

I do not think this draft includes clause 149. Wrong project?

Cl Content SC Contents P20 L46 # 428

Dawe, Piers Mellanox
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket

Annex 31A (normative) Annex 142A (normative) 142A.1Example of initial control seed sequence
 2A.2QC-LDPC FEC Encoder Test Vectors

SuggestedRemedy

Sort out formatting / document structure

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl TOC SC TOC P20 L46 # 271

Kramer, Glen Broadcom
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket

TOC entries 31A, 142A and 142A.1 all got concatenated into a single entry

SuggestedRemedy

Fix TOC format

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.