

## Comments Received

## 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 X  
 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 O

CI 200 SC 200.1 P17 L37 # 494  
 Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.  
 Comment Type T Comment Status X  
 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 O

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

CI 200 SC 200.2 P18 L26 # 498  
 Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.  
 Comment Type T Comment Status X  
 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 O

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

CI 200 SC 200.2 P18 L31 # 499  
 Remein, Duane Futurewei Technologies, Inc.  
 Comment Type E Comment Status X  
 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 O

## Comments Received

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

CI 200 SC 200.4 P19 L17 # 500

Remein, Duane

Futurewei Technologies, Inc.

Comment Type T Comment Status X

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 O

CI 200 SC 200.4.1 P19 L34 # 501

Remein, Duane

Futurewei Technologies, Inc.

Comment Type TR Comment Status X

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 O

CI 200 SC 200.4.1.2 P19 L40 # 492

Remein, Duane

Futurewei Technologies, Inc.

Comment Type E Comment Status X

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 O

CI 200 SC 200.9.13.2 P31 L12 # 493

Remein, Duane

Futurewei Technologies, Inc.

Comment Type T Comment Status X

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 O