

Proposed Responses

IEEE P802.3ca D3.1 Nx25G-EPON Task Force 1st Sponsor recirculation ballot comments

Cl 0 SC 0 P0 L0 # R1-8

Thompson, Geoffrey Independent Consultant

Comment Type ER Comment Status D

While I recognize that the ship has already sailed on this particular decision and group consensus for change is unlikely, I persist in the view that PON with P2MP does not conform to or even align with the legacy Ethernet architecture. While clearly deserving of a standard, I don't believe it belongs within IEEE Std 802.3 Standard for Ethernet.

SuggestedRemedy

Move all clauses associated with P2MP into a separate standard with a consistent architectural description and approach which applies to the entire standard.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

Comment is out of scope for this recirculation ballot.

Such a work would be out of scope for this Task Force. Also, the very same request has been brought to the IEEE 802.3 Maintenance Task Force (see http://www.ieee802.org/3/maint/requests/maint_1337.pdf), and subsequently rejected (see http://www.ieee802.org/3/maint/requests/revision_history.html#REQ1337).

No changes to the draft needed.

Cl 0 SC 0 P L # R1-5

Berger, Catherine Editorial Coordination

Comment Type G Comment Status D

This draft meets all editorial requirements.

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 141 SC 141.3.2 P70 L52 # R1-9

Thompson, Geoffrey Independent Consultant

Comment Type ER Comment Status D

The statement "these are not readily testable in a system implementation" addresses an aspect of implementation that is outside the scope of the standard. As stated, it would lead one to believe that making it testable would make an implementation not compliant. Such is definitely not the case. (The DoC for D3.0 doesn't seem to be posted as of 2020-02-15 so I can't check how my D3.0 comment was addressed.)

SuggestedRemedy

Change "are not" to "may not be" -OR- eliminate the parenthetical statement entirely.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

Comment is out of scope for this recirculation ballot.

Note that the text in question is identical to the text that already exists in multiple locations in the published IEEE Std 802.3-2018 (see 58.2.1, 59.2.1, 60.2.1, 75.3.2, 115.6.2.1)

A change (if at all needed) should be brought to the attention of IEEE 802.3 Maintenance Task Force and addressed globally in the whole IEEE Std 802.3 instead.

No changes to the draft needed.

Cl 141 SC 141.7.4 P83 L34 # R1-1

Rolfe, Benjamin

Blind Creek Associates

Comment Type T Comment Status D

A measurement may be made with the port transmitting any valid Nx25G-EPON signal.' probably is not what you meant. As 'may' is equivalent to 'may or may not', this would allow an invalid Nx25G-EPON signal to be used for the measurement. My guess is the intended meaning is that the measurement should be made with a valid Nx25G-EPON signal, any valid signal, but not an invalid signal.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to 'A measurement shall be made using a valid Nx25G-EPONsignal' which allows any valid Nx25G-EPON signal to be used, but an invalid signal would not be conformant. Editorial, 72,141.3.5.2,7,'may not' is always wrong in an IEEE standard. 'may'states an optinoal requirement

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

According to subclause 6.4.7 of the IEEE-SA Standards Board Operations Manual, "The word may is used to indicate a course of action permissible within the limits of the standard (may equals is permitted to)." Therefore, the text in question is equivalent to a statement: "A measurement is permitted to be made with the port transmitting any valid Nx25G-EPON signal." This statement is technically correct and it implies that the measurement is not permitted with the port transmitting an invalid signal. Therefore, no changes to the draft are deemed necessary.

Also note that the text in question is identical to the text that already exists in multiple locations in the published IEEE Std 802.3-2018 (see 58.7.3, 59.7.3, 60.9.3, 75.7.5)

Finally, the comment is made against an unchanged material and therefore it is out of scope for this recirculation ballot.

Cl 141 SC 141.7.13.2 P85 L35 # R1-2

Rolfe, Benjamin

Blind Creek Associates

Comment Type T Comment Status D

I do not think this is what you really mean: 'The data transmitted may be any valid 256B/257B symbols' allows that invalid symbols may be used. What probably is meant is that a sequence of any valid signals is permissible.

SuggestedRemedy

For the purpose of this measurement any valid 256B/257B symbols are permissible.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

According to subclause 6.4.7 of the IEEE-SA Standards Board Operations Manual, "The word may is used to indicate a course of action permissible within the limits of the standard (may equals is permitted to)." Therefore, the text in question is equivalent to a statement: "The data transmitted is permitted to be any valid 256B/257B symbols." This statement is technically correct and it implies that the data transmitted is not permitted to comprise any invalid 256B/257B symbols. Therefore, no changes to the draft are deemed necessary.

Also note that the text in question is identical to the text that already exists in multiple locations in the published IEEE Std 802.3-2018 (see 60.9.13.1.1, 60.9.13.2.1, 75.7.15.1)

Finally, the comment is made against an unchanged material and therefore it is out of scope for this recirculation ballot.

Proposed Responses

IEEE P802.3ca D3.1 Nx25G-EPON Task Force 1st Sponsor recirculation ballot comments

Cl 141 SC 141.7.14.1 P87 L11 # R1-3

Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Another case where the words don't mean what you think they mean. As stated allows that invalid symbols may be used. What probably is meant is that a sequence of any valid signals is permissible.

SuggestedRemedy

For the purpose of this measurement any valid 256B/257B symbols, (or a specific power synchronization sequence, are permissible.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

According to subclause 6.4.7 of the IEEE-SA Standards Board Operations Manual, "The word may is used to indicate a course of action permissible within the limits of the standard (may equals is permitted to)." Therefore, the text in question is equivalent to a statement: "The data transmitted is permitted to be any valid 256B/257B symbols." This statement is technically correct and it implies that the data transmitted is not permitted to comprise any invalid 256B/257B symbols. Therefore, no changes to the draft are deemed necessary.

Also note that the text in question is identical to the text that already exists in multiple locations in the published IEEE Std 802.3-2018 (see 60.9.13.1.1, 60.9.13.2.1, 75.7.15.1)

Finally, the comment is made against an unchanged material and therefore it is out of scope for this recirculation ballot.

Cl 141 SC 141.8.2 P88 L29 # R1-4

Rolfe, Benjamin Blind Creek Associates

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Conformance to additional laser safety standards may be required for operation within specific geographic regions.' is stating a requirement out of scope of this standard. The word may is used to indicate a course of action permissible within the limits of the standard (may equals is permitted to). This is an informative statement referring to requirements defined outside of this standard.

SuggestedRemedy

reword using correct language: Conformance to additional laser safety standards required for operation within specific geographic regions are the responsibility of the implementer of this standard.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

According to subclause 6.4.7 of the IEEE-SA Standards Board Operations Manual, "The word may is used to indicate a course of action permissible within the limits of the standard (may equals is permitted to)." Therefore, the text in question is equivalent to a statement: "Conformance to additional laser safety standards is permitted to be required for operation within specific geographic regions." This statement is technically correct. Therefore, no changes to the draft are deemed necessary.

Also note that the text in question is identical to the text that already exists in multiple locations in the published IEEE Std 802.3-2018 (see 38.7.2, 52.10.2, 53.10.2, 58.8.2, 59.8.2, 60.10.2, 75.8.2, 86.9.2, 87.9.2, 88.9.2, 89.8.2, 95.9.2, 112.8.2, 121.9.2, 122.9.2, 123.9.2, 124.9.2)

Finally, the comment is made against an unchanged material and therefore it is out of scope for this recirculation ballot.