

Proposed Responses

IEEE P802.3cs D0.1 SuperPON Task Force 1st Task Force review comments

CI 200 SC 200.1 P17 L17 # 495
 Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D
 Font in Figures 200-1, 200-2, and 200A-1 are less than required by the IEEE Style manual and unreadable unless highly magnified.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Increase the font size to at least minimum, preferably larger.
 In Fig 200-2 especially the focus appear to be the black link. The Blank link block can be shrunk horizontally by a considerable amount allowing more important information to be readable.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Given the size of the drawing, images will be placed in a vertical arrangement and font size will be increased

CI 200 SC 200.1 P17 L37 # 494
 Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type T Comment Status D
 Both OLT and ONU PMDs are full duplex; the differentiating factor is that the OLT is two fiber while the ONU is single fiber.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change:
 "the OLT PMDs are full duplex, while the ONU PMDs are bidirectional." to
 "the OLT MDI is dual fiber, while the ONU is single fiber bidirectional."
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Change:
 "the OLT PMDs are full duplex, while the ONU PMDs are bidirectional."
 to
 "the OLT MDI uses a dual-fiber arrangement, while the ONU MDI uses a single-fiber arrangement."

CI 200 SC 200.1 P18 L2 # 496
 Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type E Comment Status D
 "implementations is possible" should be "implementations are possible"
 SuggestedRemedy
 per comment
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 200 SC 200.2 P18 L26 # 498
 Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type T Comment Status D
 In Table 200-1 last row last column "0 to Fb" should refer to footnote c not b
 SuggestedRemedy
 per comment
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 200 SC 200.2 P18 L29 # 497
 Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D
 In footnote c to table 200-1 "Table <<TBD>>" should be "Table 200-4"
 SuggestedRemedy
 per comment
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Proposed Responses

IEEE P802.3cs D0.1 SuperPON Task Force 1st Task Force review comments

CI **200** SC **200.2** P18 L31 # 499
 Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **D**
 What is a "type D PMD"? This term is not defined.
 SuggestedRemedy
 In table proper change:
 "PMD direction class" to
 "PMD direction class type"
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI **200** SC **200.4** P19 L17 # 500
 Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type **T** Comment Status **D**
 We have not agree that Super-PON PMDs are "PQ type PMDs"
 If we decide that Super-PON PMDs are consistent with PQ then this would be OK.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace the 3 instances of "PQ" with "SUPER-PON"
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI **200** SC **200.4.1** P19 L34 # 501
 Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type **TR** Comment Status **D**
 We have no agreement on PMA so this statement is inappropriate:
 where "[i]" represents the PMA Channel: 0 or 1
 SuggestedRemedy
 If the TF can agree then change
 "where "[i]" represents the PMA Channel: 0 or 1" to
 "where "[i]" represents the PMA Channel: 0 or F"
 This makes an assumption that we are adopting the 25G-PON methodology and that it
 might be feasible to bond all 16 channels if an appropriately sized MPRS/PSC/PMA is
 used. If this idea is accepted then several <<TBD>> placeholders should be filled in with
 the appropriate Nx25G EPON clause number in sections 200.4.1.x.
 If this is not accepted by the TF then the "[i]" modifying PMD signal names should be
 removed throughout the draft.
 The Task for should vote on this:
 For:
 Against:
 Abstain:
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI **200** SC **200.4.1.2** P19 L40 # 492
 Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **D**
 If my previous comment regarding "[i]" (Pg 19, CI 200.4.1, line 34) is accepted the we
 should simply refer to PMD signaling description developed for Nx25G-EPON and not copy
 it here.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Replace 200.4.1.3 to 200.4.1.5 with a cross-reference in 200.4.1 to 141.3.1 as follows:
 "The PMD service interfaces for SUPER-PON PMDs are the same as PMD service
 interface for Nx25G-EPON as described in 141.3.1."
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**
 PROPOSED REJECT.

This has not been decided by the TF. Also, it is not likely that channel bonding is needed.

CI 200	SC 200.9.13.2	P31	L12	# 493
--------	---------------	-----	-----	-------

Remein, Duane

Futurewei Technologies, Inc.

Comment Type T

Comment Status D

Figure 200-4—ONU PMD Laser on/off time measurement setup should include a representation of the black link or the Laser on/off parameters need to account for any possible laser-on/off distortion due to the black link.

Similar issue in Figure 200-5—Receiver settling time measurement setup

SuggestedRemedy

For the time being add an Editor's Note in these section add:

200.9.13 - Editor's Note Laser on/off time measurement must account for any distortion due to the black link.

200.9.14 - Editor's Note Receiver settling time measurement must account for any impairment due to the black link.

Proposed Response

Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.