Cl **00** *SC* *P* *L* # **251**
Dawe, Piers Agilent

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

Ugly typeface in headings not in line with published IEEE standards

SuggestedRemedy

Instead of Helvetica Narrow (bold) use Helvetica (bold). Frame template change.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

The editor in chief can not find any instances of the ugly font in the document, and would appreciate a more specific locational reference.

Cl **00** *SC* *P* **5** *L* **13** # **633**
Barrass, Hugh Cisco Systems

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

Spelling error: "managemen"

SuggestedRemedy

Change to "management"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **00** *SC* **00** *P* *L* # **336**
Dawe, Piers Agilent

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

This is a duplicate of a comment against clause 58 because the solution is not wholly within clause 58; obviously the PMA and PCS are involved, as well as the Optical Multi-Point.
The timing parameters cannot be decided in isolation. We need to take the PMD, PMA and PCS into account, as well as upper layers. There is no point in flogging the electronics for high "efficiency" in bits delivered per nominal bit: a PON is a distributed switching system with severe latency challenges and like any such switching fabric would be expected to carry a substantial bandwidth overhead. Cost-efficiency, in bits delivered per dollar, is far more relevant.

SuggestedRemedy

Create a timing analysis which spans the full layer stack, "logic", "electronics" and "optics" before choosing timing parameters. Consider being flexible with the head end receiver timing parameters; after all, it controls the timing of the bursts it receives, so can take account its own capabilities.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
See response to comment #335 from Piers Dawe

Cl **00** *SC* **59.1** *P* **182** *L* # **601**
Tatum, Jim Honeywell

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

Text refers only to single mode fiber in line 4

SuggestedRemedy

Text must include relevant references to all fiber types.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

redirect this comment to Wael Diab

Cl **00** *SC* **59.10** *P* **199** *L* # **625**
Tatum, Jim Honeywell

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

Add "transmitter" after "optical on line 3

SuggestedRemedy

Add "transmitter" after "optical on line 3

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **00** *SC* **59.4.1** *P* **190** *L* **4** # **619**
Tatum, Jim Honeywell

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

ZZ not a valid reference

SuggestedRemedy

change to appropriate reference when meausement clause addeed

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

redirect this comment to Wael Diab

Cl **00** *SC* **59.6** *P* **195** *L* # **621**
Tatum, Jim Honeywell

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

refernces to MMF
Table needs to be completed per link budget calculations

SuggestedRemedy

Numb ers TBD from simulations at conference

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

redirect this comment to Wael Diab

Cl **00** *SC* **59-17** *P* *L* # **629**
Tatum, Jim Honeywell

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **D**
Table incomplete

SuggestedRemedy
numbers to be generated at meeting

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
Redirect this comment to Wael Diab

Cl **00** *SC* **Table 59-14** *P* **196** *L* # **622**
Tatum, Jim Honeywell

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **D**
Table incomplete

SuggestedRemedy
Fill in with values from simulations at confernece

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
redirect this comment to Wael Diab

Cl **00** *SC* **Table 59-15** *P* *L* # **623**
Tatum, Jim Honeywell

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **D**
Table contains references to TP1 and TP4

SuggestedRemedy
Remove as these are not valid test points

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
redirect this comment to Wael Diab

Cl **00** *SC* **Table 59-6** *P* **188** *L* **20** # **617**
Tatum, Jim Honeywell

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **D**
No value for max receive power, return loss, or 3dB bandwidth limit

SuggestedRemedy
max power =-3dBm
Return loss = 12dB
Recive BW max = 1500MHz

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
redirect this comment to Wael Diab

Cl **01** *SC* **1.4.15** *P* **209** *L* **15** # **255**
Dawe, Piers Agilent

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **D**
Update 1.4.15 definition of 100BASE-X. (This comment is entered against clauses 1 and 60.)

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
see response to comment #254 from Piers Dawe

Cl **24** *SC* **24.2.3.2** *P* **8** *L* **11** # **345**
Tom Mathey Independent

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **D**
Use of register bit 6.5 will require opening clause 28 to add this bit to table.

SuggestedRemedy
As above.

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

See comment #420.

Cl **24** *SC* **24.2.3.2** *P* **8** *L* **9** # **420**
Daines, Kevin World Wide Packets

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **D**
The management register bit mr_oam_enable does not currently exist in the AN expansion register definitions contained within either Clause 28 or Clause 37. This bit likely needs to be added to both the 100 Mb and 1000 Mb Register 6 definitions.

Comment applies to 36.2.5.1.3, page 32, line 9 as well.

SuggestedRemedy
Add Clause 28 (sigh) to the list of clauses that need to be updated. Add bit 6.5 to 28.2.4.1.5 Auto-Negotiation Expansion Register.

Add Clause 37 to the list of clauses that need to be updated. Add bit 6.5 to 37.2.5.1.5 AN expansion register.

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

Cl **30** *SC* **30.11.1.1.3** *P* **26** *L* **44** # **115**

Daines, Kevin World Wide Packets

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

"OAM Frames" should be changed to "OAMPDUs". See 30.7.1.1.19.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "...OAM frames..." to "OAMPDUs"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **30** *SC* **30.11.1.1.3** *P* **26** *L* **45** # **116**

Daines, Kevin World Wide Packets

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

Fill in missing information.

Mux:MAC_UNITDATA.request

44
This counter
is incremented when a ?????.request primitive is generated within the OAM sublayer.;

SuggestedRemedy

Change "...when a ?????.request primitive is generated..." to "...when a Mux:MA_UNITDATA.request primitive is generated..."

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

MA_UNITDATA is being changed to MA_DATA per Comment #143.

Cl **30** *SC* **30.11.1.1.4** *P* **27** *L* **6** # **117**

Daines, Kevin World Wide Packets

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

The criteria for determining a valid OAMPDU is incomplete.

This counter is incremented on reception of a valid frame with a lengthOrType field value equal to the reserved Type for Slow_Protocols_Type as specified in Annex 43B.;

SuggestedRemedy

Change second sentence BEHAVIOUR section to:

"This counter is incremented on reception of a valid frame with (1) a destinationField equal to the reserved multicast address for Slow_Protocols specified in Table 43B-1, (2) lengthOrType field value equal to the reserved Type for Slow_Protocols as specified in Table 43B-2, (3) a Slow_Protocols subtype value equal to the subtype reserved for OAM as specified in Table 43B-3.;"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **30** *SC* **30.11.1.1.5** *P* **27** *L* **18** # **118**

Daines, Kevin World Wide Packets

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

The BEHAVIOUR section is incorrect.

SuggestedRemedy

Change BEHAVIOUR section to:

"A count of OAMPDUs received that contain an OAM code from Table 55-1 that are not supported by the device. This counter is incremented on reception of a valid frame with (1) destinationField equal to the reserved multicast address for Slow_Protocols specified in Table 43B-1, (2) lengthOrType field value equal to the reserved Type for Slow_Protocols as specified in Table 43B-2, (3) a Slow_Protocols subtype value equal to the subtype reserved for OAM as specified in Table 43B-3, (4) an OAM code for a function that is not supported by the device.;"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **30** *SC* **30.11.1.1.6** *P* **27** *L* **30** # **119**

Daines, Kevin World Wide Packets

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

The BEHAVIOUR section is incorrect.

SuggestedRemedy

Change BEHAVIOUR section to:

"A count of OAM Ping Request PDUs passed to the OAM subordinate sublayer for transmission that contain the Ping Request code specified in Table 55-1. This counter is incremented when a Mux:MA_UNITDATA.request primitive is generated within the OAM sublayer with an OAM code indicating Ping Request operation.;"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **30** *SC* **30.11.1.1.7** *P* **27** *L* **48** # **120**

Daines, Kevin World Wide Packets

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

The BEHAVIOUR section is incorrect.

SuggestedRemedy

Change BEHAVIOUR section to:

"A count of OAMPDUs received that contain the Ping Response code specified in Table 55-1. This counter is incremented on reception of a valid frame, with (1) destinationField equal to the reserved multicast address for Slow_Protocols specified in Table 43B-1, (2) lengthOrType field value equal to the reserved Type for Slow_Protocols as specified in Table 43B-2, (3) a Slow_Protocols subtype value equal to the subtype reserved for OAM as specified in Table 43B-3, (4) the OAM code equals the Ping Response code.;"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **30** *SC* **30.11.1.1.8** *P* **27** *L* **54** # **121**

Daines, Kevin World Wide Packets

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

The other OAMPDU codes are missing and should be added to new sections beginning with 30.11.1.1.8

SuggestedRemedy

Add:

aOAMStatusTx, aOAMStatusRx, aOAMKeepAliveTx, aOAMKeepAliveRx, aOAMEventNotificationTx, aOAMEventNotificationRx, aOAMLoopbackTx, aOAMLoopbackRx, aOAMVariableRequestTx, aOAMVariableRequestRx, aOAMVariableResponseTx, aOAMVariableResponseRx

using the pattern found in 30.11.1.1.6 and 30.11.1.1.7

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **30** *SC* **30.2.2.1** *P* **12** *L* **35** # **349**

Brown, Benjamin AMCC

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

Figure reference is wrong.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "Figures 0-3" to "Figures 30-3"

This appears numerous times in this clause. A blanket search for "Figures 0" should find them all.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Same as comment #111

Cl **30** *SC* **30.2.2.1** *P* **12** *L* **35** # **111**

Daines, Kevin World Wide Packets

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

Figure 0-3 should be 30-3.

This problem appears numerous times. For instance, pg 13 ln 13, pg 13 ln 29

SuggestedRemedy

Figure 0-3 should be changed to 30-3.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **30** *SC* **30.2.2.1** *P* **12** *L* **35** # **112**
Daines, Kevin World Wide Packets

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**
Figure 55-1 is incorrectly numbered.

This problem appears numerous times. For instance, pg 13 ln 13, pg 13 ln 40

SuggestedRemedy
Figure 55-1 should be 30-4.

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

Cl **30** *SC* **30.2.2.1** *P* **13** *L* # **351**
Brown, Benjamin AMCC

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**
miss ing commas to match other descriptions

SuggestedRemedy
Line:
22: Replace "implemented oOMPMuxing" with "implemented, oOMPMuxing"
23: Replace "Otherwise if" with "Otherwise, if"
34: Replace "Otherwise if" with "Otherwise, if"
35: Replace "implemented a" with "implemented, a"
36: Replace "Otherwise if" with "Otherwise, if"
51: Replace "Otherwise if" with "Otherwise, if"

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

Cl **30** *SC* **30.2.2.1** *P* **13** *L* **20** # **350**
Brown, Benjamin AMCC

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**
wrong tense

SuggestedRemedy
Replace "supply" with "supplied"

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

Cl **30** *SC* **30.2.2.1** *P* **13** *L* **20** # **113**
Daines, Kevin World Wide Packets

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**
"...link partner supply through the OAM protocol." contains a grammar error.

SuggestedRemedy
Should read "...link partner supplied through the OAM protocol."

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

Same as comment #350.

Cl **30** *SC* **30.2.2.1** *P* **14** *L* **6** # **352**
Brown, Benjamin AMCC

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**
missing words

SuggestedRemedy
Replace
"implemented, contained"
with
"implemented, oOMPEmulation is contained"

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

Cl **30** *SC* **30.2.3** *P* **15** *L* **37** # **114**
Daines, Kevin World Wide Packets

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**
Figure 55-2 is incorrectly numbered.

SuggestedRemedy
Figure 55-2 should be 30-5.

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

Cl **30** *SC* **30.3.2.1.3** *P* **20** *L* **13** # **530**

Richard Brand Nortel Networks

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

Agree that this statement must be modified but disagree that only Copper PHYs may be subject of the change

SuggestedRemedy

This attribute will need update when all of the PHYs have been finalized.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **30** *SC* **30.5.1.1.2** *P* **21** *L* **26** # **583**

Nguyen, Trung National Semiconduct

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

Naming convention of 100Base PMDs is not consistent with those used in Clauses 60.

SuggestedRemedy

Change 100BASE-BXT to 100BASE-BX-OLT.
Change 100BASE-BXU to 100BASE-BX-ONU

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Port types will be consistent as the port naming conventions are resolved. Clause 30 will be made consistent with the EFM Clauses.

Cl **30A** *SC* **30.3.1.1.31** *P* *L* # **5**

Marris, Arthur Cadence Design Syste

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

There needs to be a managed object to indicate whether a MAC configured for half-duplex operation can transmit and receive simultaneously. This is necessary for the MAC-PHY rate-matching receive process.

SuggestedRemedy

Add a third entry to the sequence for aMACCapabilities:-

half duplex with simultaneous receive and transmit Capable of transmitting and receiving simultaneously when configured for half duplex mode.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Comment is against Clause 30, 30.3.1.1.31, which is found on page 779 of IEEE 802.3-2000.

The MAC operation for EFM Copper links is neither classical full nor half-duplex.

Cl **36** *SC* *P* *L* # **383**

Bhatt, Vipul (Not Applicable)

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

The suggested text is a beginning point. Over future revisions of the draft, this section can be further refined.

In order to make the best selection of Optical PMD burst mode parameters (laser turn on/off and receiver recovery times), we need to know how long the PMA will take to synchronize in the presence of an incoming burst. The purpose of this comment is to insert a placeholder for future work. The use of plesiochronous links is not excluded, but for now, the performance in the presence of synchronous links is specified.

The value suggested (800 bit times) is a bit more aggressive than what was indicated in my note dated 8/23/2002 to EFM reflector. I believe there is room to permit this aggressiveness, and in order to keep system efficiency reasonably high, the pain will have to be shared equally between PMA and PMD.

The use of COM_DET as an indicator of lock is necessary because there is no mandatory signal defined in Clause 36 that reflects the state of having acquired a lock. This should serve for now as an interim solution.

SuggestedRemedy

Insert subclause 36.3.9, title "Burst Mode Specifications". Add text as follows:

"In the presence of received data pattern as defined in subclause 56.x.y.z, COM_DET shall assert in less than 800 bit times, when PMA_TX_CLK frequency is equal to twice the PMA_RX_CLK frequency. "

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Will include this suggested remedy as a placeholder and solicit comments in future drafts.

Cl **45** *SC* *P* *L* # **653**

O'Mahony, Barry Intel Corp.

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

The Copper PHYs all have a large set of management objects that must be controlled. Clause 45 registers are needed to implement these.

SuggestedRemedy

Develop new registers for Clause 45 corresponding to existing management objects for 10PASS-TS, 2PASS-TL, 2PASS-TS DSL PMDs

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT. Clause 45 as written in draft 1 already begins to document the register control of these objects. Clause 45 is incomplete, and the editor will continue work, primarily on MCM 10PASS-TS, 2PASS-TL, 2BASE-TL.

Cl **45** *SC* *P* *L* # **157**

Simon, Scott — Cisco Systems, Inc.

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

Registers need to be added for PHY counters such as corrected FEC errors, uncorrected FEC errors, etc

SuggestedRemedy

The editor should add such counters.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT. The draft already contains FEC corrected and uncorrected counter registers.

Cl **45** *SC* *P* *L* # **353**

Brown, Benjamin — AMCC

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

Why are there any register changes to Clause 45? These are registers for 10GE. All 100M and 1G registers are in Clause 22.

SuggestedRemedy

Move new registers to Clause 22.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT. The approved copper baseline specifies that copper control will use the Clause 45 register access method. Clause 45 registers are needed due to the large number of copper parameters.

Cl **45** *SC* **45.1** *P* **33** *L* **44** # **67**

Turner, Ed — Lattice Semiconductor

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

The convention adopted in 100BASE-T2 and 1000BASE-T was to use the terminology 'master' and 'slave'. EFM should be consistent to this terminology.

SuggestedRemedy

Globally replace throughout the clause the term 'LT' with 'master' and 'NT' with 'slave'. Editorialise around each replacement as necessary to correct grammar.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT. EFM copper has defined two port types, the LT and NT (although that nomenclature may change). From a functional perspective, the NT appears to be a slave, but in the context of Clause 45 it is appropriate to define separate behavior for registers based on the port type that implements then.

Cl **45** *SC* **45.2.2.1** *P* **35** *L* **20** # **648**

Barrass, Hugh — Cisco Systems

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

The PMD available register may be writeable for NT devices in order that the capabilities can be limited prior to loop aggregation discovery.

SuggestedRemedy

Change Table 45.3 R/W column to show that LT devices are RO, NT devices are RW with a footnote.

Add footnote:

This register may optionally be writeable for NT devices. In the case where PMIs may be aggregated to multiple MIIs the availability must be limited such that no PMI may be mapped to multiple MIIs prior to enabling the links.
In this case, the reset state of the PMD_available_register must reflect the capabilites of the device, the management entity must reset appropriate bits to meet the restriction described.

If the NT device is not capable of aggregating PMIs to multiple MIIs then the PMD_available_register may be read only.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. The suggested footnote text will be added as an addition to 45.2.2.1

Cl **45** *SC* **45.2.2.1** *P* **35** *L* **4** # **354**

Brown, Benjamin — AMCC

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

Wrong word in bullet c

SuggestedRemedy

Replace "market" with "marked"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **45** *SC* **45.2.2.3** *P* **36** *L* **29** # **86**

Turner, Ed — Lattice Semiconductor

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

The IEEE style guide advises against the use of the word 'will'.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete the word 'will'. Also search and replace or modify 'will' throughout the rest of the clause.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT. The editor will make the suggested change.

Cl **45** *SC* **45.3.1.1** *P* **37** *L* **53** # **89**

Turner, Ed — Lattice Semiconductor

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

Missing bit definition text.

SuggestedRemedy

Insert subsections that describe the behavior of each bit (as you did in 45.2.1.1)

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT. The editor will write appropriate bit definitions.

Cl **45** *SC* **45.3.1.2** *P* **38** *L* **25** # **90**

Turner, Ed — Lattice Semiconductor

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

Missing bit definition text.

SuggestedRemedy

Insert subsections that describe the behavior of each bit (as you did in 45.2.1.1)

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT. The editor will write appropriate bit definitions.

Cl **45** *SC* **45.3.1.4** *P* **38** *L* **46** # **69**

Turner, Ed — Lattice Semiconductor

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

The text does not fully describe the necessary behavior of the counter.

SuggestedRemedy

A good text to describe counter behavior that was adopted for 802.3ae is : "The <counter_name> counter is a <number_of_bits> bit counter that contains the number of <things_to_count>. These bits shall be reset to all zeroes when the <counter_name> counter is read by the management function or upon execution of the MMD reset. These bits shall be held at all ones in the case of overflow."
Apply this text to the counter here, and any other counters in the clause.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT. The editor will adapt the suggested text for each counter.

Cl **45** *SC* **45.3.1.4** *P* **38** *L* **47** # **346**

Tom Mathey — Independent

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

The case where the number of errors is greater than that which can be corrected needs to be covered. For this case, the total number of bits in error is unknown.

SuggestedRemedy

Discuss.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. The editor suggests that the uncorrectable error counter increment every time the maximum number of correctable bits in a frame is found to be errored. This should equal the number of frames that are passed to the MAC with a RX_ERR indication, when that indication is due to an uncorrectable frame. Thus this counter corresponds to the number of uncorrectable frames, not bits.

If the comment is accepted, the editor will make the appropriate changes to the text.

Cl **45** *SC* **45.4.1** *P* *L* # **158**

Simon, Scott — Cisco Systems, Inc.

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

The registers that control link parameters should have upper and lower bounds assigned to them. The exact bounds should be discussed by the TF.

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. The editor askes the task force to help decide the appropriate bounds for these registers. These bounds are important since the expectation is that all PHYs must support any possible settings of these registers.

Cl **45** *SC* **45.4.1** *P* *L* # **155**

Simon, Scott — Cisco Systems, Inc.

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

We need registers so that the PHY can report its perceived RX Power and Avg. SNR for each RX band.

SuggestedRemedy

The editor for clause 45 should write such registers

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **45** *SC* **45.4.1.1** *P* **30** *L* **54** # **91**

Turner, Ed — Lattice Semiconductor

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

Missing bit definition text.

SuggestedRemedy

Insert subsections that describe the behavior of each bit (as you did in 45.2.1.1)

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT. The editor will write such bit definitions.

Cl **45** *SC* **45.4.1.1** *P* **39** *L* **22** # **87**

Turner, Ed — Lattice Semiconductor

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

Avoid the word 'should'. Writing to a bit 'shall' activate or deactivate the parameter.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace 'should' with 'shall'.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **45** *SC* **45.4.1.2** *P* **40** *L* **46** # **92**

Turner, Ed — Lattice Semiconductor

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

Missing bit definition text.

SuggestedRemedy

Insert subsections that describe the behavior of each bit (as you did in 45.2.1.1)

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT. The editor will write appropriate bit definitions.

Cl **45** *SC* **45.4.1.3** *P* **41** *L* **42** # **93**

Turner, Ed — Lattice Semiconductor

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

Missing bit definition text.

SuggestedRemedy

Insert subsections that describe the behavior of each bit (as you did in 45.2.1.1)

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT. The editor will write appropriate bit definitions.

Cl **45** *SC* **45.5** *P* **46** *L* # **655**

O'Mahony, Barry — Intel Corp.

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

This is an inappropriate level of detail in which to control a DMT system. The entities above the MDIO simply do not have sufficient knowledge to exercise this level of control. For example, it has no way of knowing that a bridge tap creates a notch at a certain frequency, or that the single-frequency interferer a tone index i is slowly drifting over to index i+2.

In a sense, this level of control is equivalent to having the management entity specifying the equalizer and precoder tap values in a single-carrier system. It would probably lead to the same result; link failure in a large percentage of cases on real loops.

Note also that, in most implementations, individual tones cannot arbitrarily be assigned to the US or DS direction.

The PMD control attributes should be used to control behavior externally visible at the interfaces to the PMD; e.g., bit rate of US/DS, latency, overall transmit PSD, etc.

SuggestedRemedy

Base the attributes on those already defined in the appropriate DSL MIB. Those attributes are capable of being controlled by an external-to-PMD management entity.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Suggest the following changes:

Replace the current MCM control registers with the following:

LT Band Boundary Register: contains fields that set the upper and lower tone for the LT TX and RX frequency bands.

NT Band Boundary Register: contains fields that set the upper and lower tone for the LT TX and RX frequency bands.

LT Bit Loading Register: contains fields that specify the average number of bits per tone for each of the LT TX frequency bands. (this register effectively controls the target downstream SNR)

NT Bit Loading Register: contains fields that specify the average number of bits per tone for each of the NT TX frequency bands. (this register effectively controls the target upstream SNR)

Maintain the Tone Group register (45.5.1.2) to allow the PHY's max PSD to be specified in piecewise fashion.

The Tone Control Parameter register (45.5.1.3) is modified to retain only the PSD level bits (1.x+1.7:0). Changes to this register take place immediately.

The Tone Control Action register (45.5.1.4) is removed. The Tone Table refresh function (1.x.4) is moved to the MSB of the Tone Control Parameter Register after the modifications discussed above.

The Tone Table (45.5.1.5) is retained to allow the state of the PHY to be queried. This will be important when determining an implementation's compliance with the standard as well as installation debugging.

Cl **45** *SC* **45.5.1.1** *P* *L* **18** # **6**

Marris, Arthur — Cadence Design Syste

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

"discreetly" spelled wrong

SuggestedRemedy

delete word altogether or replace with "discretely"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **45** *SC* **45.5.1.3** *P* **47** *L* **18** # **94**

Turner, Ed — Lattice Semiconductor

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

Missing bit definition text.

SuggestedRemedy

Insert subsections that describe the behavior of each bit (as you did in 45.2.1.1)

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT. The editor will write appropriate bit definitions.

Cl **45** *SC* **45.5.1.4** *P* **47** *L* **46** # **88**

Turner, Ed — Lattice Semiconductor

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

Missing bit definition text.

SuggestedRemedy

Insert subsections that describe the behavior of each bit (as you did in 45.2.1.1)

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **45** *SC* **45.5.1.5** *P* **49** *L* # **343**

Simon, Scott — Cisco Systems, Inc.

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

Table 45-29 has a typo in the first line.

SuggestedRemedy

Please change 6.3tt.15 to 6.3t.15

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **45** *SC* **Table 45-2** *P* **34** *L* **41** # **68**

Turner, Ed — Lattice Semiconductor

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

This table, and others like it throughout the clause are missing a footnote to explain the meaning of the abbreviations used in the 'R/W' column.

SuggestedRemedy

Add footnote to this table, and all others throughout the clause, that includes explanations of the entries in the 'R/W' column.
For example, this table just needs 'R/W = Read/Write'. Other tables may require 'R/W = Read/Write, RO = Read Only'.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT. The editor will add such notes for the next draft.

Cl **45** *SC* **Table 45-29** *P* **48** *L* **15** # **70**

Turner, Ed — Lattice Semiconductor

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

Two 't's in first column.

SuggestedRemedy

Change '6.3tt.15' to '6.3t.15'.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **45** *SC* **Table 45-4** *P* **35** *L* **44** # **355**

Brown, Benjamin — AMCC

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

missing period

SuggestedRemedy

Replace "3.4715:0" with "3.47.15:0"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **54** *SC* **54** *P* **51** *L* **13** # **285**

Dawe, Piers Agilent

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

OLT and ONU are bad nomenclature.

They are not true opposites.

One cannot extract any meaning from them, apart from that something is optical: what is the difference between a "Line Termination" and a "Network Unit"? How can one tell which is the centre of the star and which is used multiple times at its points?

SuggestedRemedy

What does the cable TV industry use?

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

Pending resolution of numerous comments on naming

Cl **54** *SC* **54.1** *P* **51** *L* **37** # **135**

Daines, Kevin World Wide Packets

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

Based on the "Registered" symbol on page 54, line 46 (and page 55, line 38), should the "IEEE 802.3" found on page 51, line 37 also have one?

SuggestedRemedy

Add "Registered" symbol after "IEEE 802.3"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.
It turns out that putting an ® after IEEE 802.3 is incorrect practice.
The standards office has recently updated their guidelines on
the use of trademark symbols, and we will comply with the new
guidelines.

Cl **54** *SC* **54.1** *P* **51** *L* **39** # **705**

Jonathan Thatcher World Wide Packets

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

There are multiple places throughout the entire document where "point to point" and "point to multi point" are handled differently.

SuggestedRemedy

Recommend global usage of "point-to-point" and "point-to-multi-point"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Will consult with IEEE project editor for
her recommendation on the hyphenation of
these terms.

Cl **54** *SC* **54.1** *P* **52** *L* **20** # **704**

Jonathan Thatcher World Wide Packets

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

Missing 2 Mb/s link segments

SuggestedRemedy

Add 2 Mb/s link segment

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.
Will add two mbps link segment in next draft

Cl **54** *SC* **54.1** *P* **52** *L* **36** # **531**

Richard Brand Nortel Networks

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

Delete the subclause, "as was originally intended in the earliest editions of this standard." Place the period after frames

SuggestedRemedy

Although this statement is probably true, it is not our responsibility to interpret the intent of the original members.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Actually, the intent is reflected in
4.1.1. The commenter is referred to
the text describing half duplex operation,
at item a).

Cl **54** *SC* **54.1.1** *P* **52** *L* **42** # **7**

Marris, Arthur Cadence Design Syste

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

Should itn't be "within" rather than "with"

SuggestedRemedy

Replace "with" with "within"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **54** *SC* **54.1.1** *P* **52** *L* **42** # **356**
Brown, Benjamin AMCC

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

wrong word

SuggestedRemedy

replace "with the MAC Control" with "within the MAC Control"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **54** *SC* **54.1.4** *P* **53** *L* **4753** # **357**
Brown, Benjamin AMCC

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

inconsistency between
"OLT long wavelength laser" and
"long wavelength ONU laser"

This is on both the first and second paragraphs in 54.1.4

SuggestedRemedy

Reconcile to use one or the other, I don't care which.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Pending resolution of naming issues

Cl **54** *SC* **54.1.5** *P* **55** *L* **7** # **703**
Jonathan Thatcher World Wide Packets

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

Need to be using same naming convention throughout the document (compare Table 54-1) to p 21.
10PASS-TA vs 10PASST
1000BASE-BXT vs 1000BASE-BX-OLT
etc, etc.

SuggestedRemedy

Rectify

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **54** *SC* **Figure 54-1** *P* **52** *L* **25** # **133**
Daines, Kevin World Wide Packets

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

OAM is listed in the acronym definition section of the figure but not in the layer diagram.

SuggestedRemedy

Add OAM sublayer, which is required for EFM networks, between LLC and MAC Control sublayers.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **54** *SC* **Figure 54-2** *P* **53** *L* **27** # **134**
Daines, Kevin World Wide Packets

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

OAM is listed in the acronym definition section of the figure but not in the layer diagram.

SuggestedRemedy

Add OAM sublayer, which is required for EFM networks, between LLC and MAC Control sublayers.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **55** *SC* **55.1.1** *P* **58** *L* **20** # **358**
Brown, Benjamin AMCC

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

missing comma

SuggestedRemedy

replace "functions which" with "functions, which"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **55** *SC* **55.1.3** *P* **58** *L* **34** # **675**

Squire, Matt — Hatteras Networks

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

The section lacks an introductory paragraph or statement and is therefore difficult to read.

SuggestedRemedy

Include an introductory statement in the section. Suggestion:

This section provides additional details on the functional requirements for OAM in Ethernet networks. Each of the objectives is clarified with a number of statements, and any additional miscellaneous clarifications are also detailed.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **55** *SC* **55.1.3** *P* **58** *L* **37** # **676**

Squire, Matt — Hatteras Networks

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

I don't think the clause numbers listed match the actual clauses any more. E.g. 61 is the aggregation section, not one of the copper access PHYs.

SuggestedRemedy

Match to current document structure.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

55.1.3 bullet 2) will now read:

"Subscriber access physical layer devices, defined in Clauses 58, 59, 62 and 63 should support unidirectional operation to allow OAM remote fault indication during fault conditions."

55.1.3 bullet 3) will now read:

"Physical layer devices other than those defined in Clauses 58, 59, 62 and 63 may support unidirectional operating thus allowing OAM remote fault indication during fault conditions."

Cl **55** *SC* **55.1.3** *P* **58** *L* **37** # **714**

Jonathan Thatcher — World Wide Packets

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

Line 37: 55.1.3.a.2 "should" implies that this is not required. It is. There should be a shall statement. It may or may not be here. Don't want redundant shalls.

Line 49: 55.1.3.d.1 similarly, "must" has similar problem.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the words "should" and "must."

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **55** *SC* **55.1.3** *P* **58** *L* **3738** # **190**

Onishi, Kazumi — Oki Electric Industry C

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

On PON architecture, if an ONU detects receiving signal failure, the ONU should stop transmitting to prevent upward signals collision caused by its local time inaccuracy.
For the above reason, PON system does not support unidirectional operation which direction is from ONU to OLT.

SuggestedRemedy

2) Subscriber access physical layer devices, defined in Clause 59, 60 and 61 should support unidirectional operation to allow OAM remote fault indication during fault conditions.
Subscriber access physical layer devices, defined in Clause 58 should support unidirectional operation in the drectoin from OLT to ONU that allows OAM remote fault indication from OLT during fault conditions.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **55** *SC* **55.1.3** *P* **58** *L* **40** # **359**

Brown, Benjamin — AMCC

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

wrong word

SuggestedRemedy

replace "operating" with "operation"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Same as comment #15.

Cl **55** *SC* **55.1.3** *P* **58** *L* **40** # **533**
Richard Brand Nortel Networks

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**
"operating"

SuggestedRemedy
Should read operation

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

Same as comment #15.

Cl **55** *SC* **55.1.3** *P* **58** *L* **40** # **15**
MARTIN, DAVID NORTEL NETWORKS

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**
Typo

SuggestedRemedy
Change "unidirectional operating" => "unidirectional operation"

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

Cl **55** *SC* **55.1.3** *P* **58** *L* **51** # **40**
MARTIN, DAVID NORTEL NETWORKS

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **D**
Refers to "A general communications mechanism". Where is the "general communications mechanism" defined in clause 55? Is this a reference to the Variable Request / Response capability? Or is it a reference to the Vendor Specific codes?

SuggestedRemedy
In the appropriate sub-clause add some wording like "this can be used as a general communications mechanism".

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

The "general communications mechanism" is the Vendor Extension mechanism.

Recommend we change d-3 to read "A vendor extension mechanism is provided and made available for higher layer management applications".

Cl **55** *SC* **55.1.4** *P* **59** *L* **1** # **677**
Squire, Matt Hatteras Networks

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**
Lack of introductory paragraph or statment makes 55.1.4 difficult to read.

SuggestedRemedy
Add introductory statement:

This section explicitly lists certain functions that are not addressed by Ethernet OAM. These functions, though value OAM functions in networks, do not fall within the scope of 802.3.

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

Suggest minor wording change, to:

"This section explicitly lists certain functions that are not addressed by OAM. These functions, while valuable in subscriber access networks, do not fall within the scope of 802.3."

Cl **55** *SC* **55.1.4** *P* **59** *L* **3** # **532**
Richard Brand Nortel Networks

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **D**
add "protection switching" to the functions

SuggestedRemedy
to now read: Management functions not pertaining to a single link such as protection switching, station management and subscriber management are not covered by this clause.

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

Same as comment #26.

Cl **55** *SC* **55.1.4** *P* **59** *L* **3** # **26**
MARTIN, DAVID NORTEL NETWORKS

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **D**
This might be the appropriate place to have a disclaimer regarding link protection / restoration.

SuggestedRemedy
Change "Management functions not pertaining to a single link such as station management" => "Management functions not pertaining to a single link, such as protection switching, station management,"

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

Cl **55** *SC* **55.1.4** *P* **59** *L* **5** # **360**

Brown, Benjamin AMCC

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

misspelling

SuggestedRemedy

replace "communcations" with "communications"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **55** *SC* **55.1.4** *P* **59** *L* **6** # **706**

Jonathan Thatcher World Wide Packets

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

Here, it is indicated that "negotiation" is a non-objective. In some notes in clause, there are references to "negotiation."

SuggestedRemedy

Global search and replace negotiation with "capability discovery" except in non-objectives.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **55** *SC* **55.1.5** *P* **59** *L* **24** # **713**

Jonathan Thatcher World Wide Packets

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

Use of word "(OPTIONAL)" in OAM sublayer in Figure 55-1 is confusing. Similarly, use of word optional on line 13 under 55.1.5 has same problem.

SuggestedRemedy

Add a footnote to "OAM" In the footnote, indicate that this is required for (add list of port types) and optional for all others.
On line 13 change "an optional sublayer" to "a sublayer" or elaborate fully when it is required...

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.

The last two projects (802.3x and 802.3ad) that added optional sublayers above the MAC had figures which stated they were, in fact, optional.

Cl **55** *SC* **55.1.5** *P* **5960** *L* **13** # **146**

Ken, Murakami Mitsubishi Electric

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

The current positioning of OAM is strange. The OAM frames are identified using DA and Type fields. These fields are terminated within MAC layer. Therefore, OAM should be located immediately above MAC layer.

SuggestedRemedy

OAM should be one of the MAC Control functionalities like OMP and PAUSE.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.

OAM is based upon Slow Protocols and is modeled after Clause 43 Link Aggregation. Link Ag defines a set of frames distinguished by their Destination Address (Slow_Protocols_Multicast_Address), Type Field (Slow_Protocol_Type) and Subtype (1 or 2).

OAMPDUs, like Link Ag, are distinguished by their DA, Type Field and Subtype.

Cl **55** *SC* **55.1.5, Fig.55-2** *P* **60** *L* **1** # **43**

MARTIN, DAVID NORTEL NETWORKS

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

There should be an interface to STA shown on the Fig.55-2 OAM Control block.

SuggestedRemedy

Add a bidirectional arrow on either the left or right side of the Fig.55-2 OAM Control block going to STA.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.

Figure 55-2 was patterned after Figure 43-2. Since Figure 43-2 doesn't have an explicit connection to Station Management, one wasn't included for Figure 55-2. Other than the MDC/MDIO interface to PHYs, STA has never had explicit connections to the sublayers.

Cl **55** *SC* **55.1.6** *P* **61** *L* **1** # **679**

Squire, Matt — Hatteras Networks

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

Since we talk about buffering/discarding packets when in loopback, and we're showing packet flows via the arrows in the diagram, we should add arrows at the top showing data from the MAC client getting buffered or discarded.

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.

Perhaps it would be better to address Comment #363 and clarify the exact behavior in the state machine.

Cl **55** *SC* **55.1.6.1** *P* **60** *L* **32** # **678**

Squire, Matt — Hatteras Networks

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

The first sentence "OAM is intended for full-duplex 802.l3 physical layer devices" doesn't seem right, as the packet-based OAM can operate in half-duplex mode. Also, the clause #s are wrong.

SuggestedRemedy

New first sentence: OAM is designed to be implementable on any 802.3 physical layer device.

Fix clause #s to match current spec.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Replace with:

"OAM is intended for 802.3 physical layer devices. Implementation of OAM functionality is mandatory for subscriber access devices defined in Clauses 58, 59, 62 and 63 and optional for all other 802.3 devices."

Cl **55** *SC* **55.1.6.4** *P* **60** *L* **49** # **122**

Daines, Kevin — World Wide Packets

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

Remote and far-end are used interchangeably. Isn't remote more common?

SuggestedRemedy

Consider changing "far-end" to remote.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **55** *SC* **55.1.6.4** *P* **60** *L* **50** # **41**

MARTIN, DAVID — NORTEL NETWORKS

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

Warns that "Similarly, MAC Client frames originating in the local device may be lost if they are not properly buffered." Why should MAC Client frames from the source end of a link in loopback be affected?

SuggestedRemedy

Clarify under what conditions MAC Client frames at the source end of a link in loopback might be lost.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

So the thought here was that there are two kinds of frames being sent to a port within a switch destined to egress. The first kind are normal frames originating from other ports within the switch or a processor. The second kind are specific loopback test frames that are meant to egress a port, be looped-back by the remote end and then return to the local device's OAM layer.

The referenced text was meant to speak to the first kind of frame. When a port requests loopback of the remote device, "normal" frames destined to egress the port will be dropped if not buffered.

Cl **55** *SC* **55.1.6.4** *P* **60** *L* **52** # **16**

MARTIN, DAVID — NORTEL NETWORKS

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

Wording improvement

SuggestedRemedy

Change "existing protocols and implementations" => "existing protocols. Implementations"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **55** *SC* **55.1.7** *P* **61** *L* **28** # **534**

Richard Brand — Nortel Networks

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

"precendence"

SuggestedRemedy

Should be spelled precedence

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Same as comment #17

Cl **55** *SC* **55.1.7** *P* **61** *L* **28** # **17**
MARTIN, DAVID NORTEL NETWORKS

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

Typo

SuggestedRemedy

Change "precendence" => "precedence"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **55** *SC* **55.2** *P* **61** *L* **37** # **110**
Daines, Kevin World Wide Packets

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

"...and pass each..." has a grammar error.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to "...and passes each...".

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **55** *SC* **55.2.1(g)** *P* **62** *L* **4** # **409**
Arnold, Brian Cisco Systems

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

The text of item (g) reads "OAMPDUs are restricted to a single link." So as to clarify that this refers to the must-not-be-forwarded restriction of OAMPDUs, and not to any applicability of OAMPDUs on PHY-layer aggregated links, this should be reworded.

SuggestedRemedy

Reword item (g) as follows:

"OAMPDUs traverse a single link and must not be forwarded."

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **55** *SC* **55.2.3** *P* **62** *L* **33** # **42**
MARTIN, DAVID NORTEL NETWORKS

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

A general question that should be answered in this section somewhere: How are OAMPDUs guaranteed to be sent when they are required?

SuggestedRemedy

Sketch the Fig.55-4 state machine and / or the related text to ensure that an OAMPDU will be transmitted even when there is a wire rate flow from the MAC Client. Need help from someone skilled in the art (like Ben - without mentioning surnames) to do this.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **55** *SC* **55.2.3** *P* **62** *L* **42** # **535**
Richard Brand Nortel Networks

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

The word "Figure" for 55.2.3.1 is incorrect

SuggestedRemedy

Should read sub clause 55.2.3.1

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Same as comment #18

Cl **55** *SC* **55.2.3** *P* **62** *L* **42** # **18**
MARTIN, DAVID NORTEL NETWORKS

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

Typo

SuggestedRemedy

Change "in Figure 55.2.3.1" => "in sub-clause 55.2.3.1"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **55** *SC* **55.2.3** *P* **64** *L* **28** # **536**
Richard Brand Nortel Networks

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**
The word "Figure" for 55.2.4.1 is incorrect

SuggestedRemedy
Should read subclause 55.2.4.1

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

Cl **55** *SC* **55.2.3.1.2** *P* **63** *L* **11** # **681**
Squire, Matt Hatteras Networks

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**
I think RF is actually not set by management but determined by OAM and signaled to remote management

SuggestedRemedy
redefine RF to

A boolean value determined by OAM based on the link state which indicates remote fault status.

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

Link Status is found in Table 22-8 Status register bit 1.2.

Suggest:

A boolean value based on Link Status (bit 1.2) which indicates remote fault status.

Cl **55** *SC* **55.2.3.1.2** *P* **63** *L* **21** # **682**
Squire, Matt Hatteras Networks

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**
DA, SA, m_sdu, status, length, type, etc. aren't used in state diagram. This is true in all state machine sections.

SuggestedRemedy
Eliminate unused variables throughout state machine sections.

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

Cl **55** *SC* **55.2.3.1.2** *P* **63** *L* **51** # **683**
Squire, Matt Hatteras Networks

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**
Should MADI be MADR as in the diagram?

SuggestedRemedy

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

See response to #352

Cl **55** *SC* **55.2.3.1.3** *P* **63** *L* **4950** # **362**
Brown, Benjamin AMCC

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**
Wrong message

SuggestedRemedy
Replace "MADI" with "MADR"
Replace "MA_DATA.indication(DA,SA,m_sdu_status)" with "MA_DATA.request(DA,m_sdu,service_class)"

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

Cl **55** *SC* **55.2.3.1.3** *P* **63** *L* **50** # **150**
Aoki, Yasuhide NTT

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**
"MADI"and"Alias for MA_DATA.indication"should be changed into "MADR"and"Alias for MA_DATA.request".

SuggestedRemedy

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

See response to #352

Cl **55** *SC* **55.2.4** *P* **64** *L* **28** # **19**
MARTIN, DAVID NORTEL NETWORKS

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

Typo

SuggestedRemedy

Change "in Figure 55.2.4.1" => "in sub-clause 55.2.4.1"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **55** *SC* **55.2.4.1.2** *P* **64** *L* **47** # **684**
Squire, Matt Hatteras Networks

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

lb variable not used in diagram

SuggestedRemedy

need to update diagram for loopback state.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **55** *SC* **55.2.5** *P* **66** *L* **22** # **537**
Richard Brand Nortel Networks

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

SuggestedRemedy

Add "The OAM Control block is the source and sink of the OAMPDUs defined in sub-clause 55.3. STA requests / responses for OAM sublayer services interface via the OAM Control block."

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See response to #27.

Cl **55** *SC* **55.2.5** *P* **66** *L* **22** # **27**
MARTIN, DAVID NORTEL NETWORKS

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

There needs to be some introductory explanation of the function of the OAM Control block, prior to diving into the state diagram.

SuggestedRemedy

Add "The OAM Control block is the source and sink of the OAMPDUs defined in sub-clause 55.3. STA requests and responses for OAM sublayer services interface via the OAM Control block."

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **55** *SC* **55.2.5, Fig.55-6** *P* **67** *L* **12** # **45**
MARTIN, DAVID NORTEL NETWORKS

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

The Fig.55-6 state diagram should be expanded to include the triggers for NTT.

SuggestedRemedy

Expand the Fig.55-6 state diagram to include the triggers for NTT (e.g. Keep Alive timer expired, Ping Response to send, Event Notification PDU to send). Need help from someone skilled in the art (like Ben - without mentioning surnames) to do this.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

This will be addressed in conjunction with the capability discovery work forthcoming.

Cl **55** *SC* **55.2.5.1.1** *P* **66** *L* **25** # **365**
Brown, Benjamin AMCC

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

In other clauses, there is a single section for Constants, another for Variables, etc., and these sections apply to multiple state machines.

SuggestedRemedy

Reorganize this section to combine all the separate Constants, Variables, etc., sections then put all the state machines after.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

In _some_ other clauses this is true (43 is a notable exception). And, for OAM, it _would_ simplify the clause.

Cl **55** *SC* **55.2.5.1.4, Fig.55-6** *P* **67** *L* **12** # **44**

MARTIN, DAVID NORTEL NETWORKS

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

It isn't clear how a request from (or response to) STA to the OAM Control block fits into the Fig.55-6 state machine.

SuggestedRemedy

Ensure that the Fig.55-6 state machine has an interface for requests / response to STA. Need help from someone skilled in the art (like Ben - without mentioning surnames) to do this.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Ben's gracious assistance will be dutifully sought.

Cl **55** *SC* **55.3.1** *P* **67** *L* **3753** # **366**

Brown, Benjamin AMCC

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

The opening paragraph says effectively the same thing as the bullets

SuggestedRemedy

Reword this section to use either the paragraph form or the bullets but don't state the rules twice.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

This section was lifted verbatim from 43.4.2. - but it can be tidier.

Cl **55** *SC* **55.3.2** *P* **68** *L* **20** # **123**

Daines, Kevin World Wide Packets

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

The restriction on the minimum size frame seems unneeded. If a device needs to send a Dying Gasp message, it should be able to send just the minimum 64 octet frame.

SuggestedRemedy

Change 128 to 64. Note: Annex 43B already supports this size. See 43B.2 (c).

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **55** *SC* **55.3.2** *P* **68** *L* **27** # **8**

Marris, Arthur Cadence Design Syste

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

It would be nice to have the destination address filled in

SuggestedRemedy

In figure 55-7 put

"Destination Address = 01-80-C2-00-00-02"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **55** *SC* **55.3.2.1** *P* **69** *L* **12** # **21**

MARTIN, DAVID NORTEL NETWORKS

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

Clarification

SuggestedRemedy

Change "indicates an alarm condition has occurred" => "indicates a local alarm condition has occurred"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **55** *SC* **55.3.2.1** *P* **69** *L* **12** # **541**

Richard Brand Nortel Networks

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

Add a word

SuggestedRemedy

To read: "indicates a local alarm condition has occurred."

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Same as comment #21.

Cl **55** *SC* **55.3.2.1** *P* **69** *L* **14** # **542**
Richard Brand Nortel Networks

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

Add verbage

SuggestedRemedy

To read: "The specification of the specific faults comprising the Local Link Fault, Remote Link Fault, Dying Gasp, and Alarm Indication flags is beyond the scope of this standard.' primarily due to the multiple Physical layers possible.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #30.

Cl **55** *SC* **55.3.2.1** *P* **69** *L* **14** # **30**
MARTIN, DAVID NORTEL NETWORKS

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

It's my understanding that since there are a suite of possible PHY types, specifying the extact PHY fault triggers rolled into the Flag indications is not in the clause 55 gameplan. That should be stated.

SuggestedRemedy

Add "The specification of the specific faults comprising the Local Link Fault, Remote Link Fault, Dying Gasp, and Alarm Indication flags is beyond the scope of this standard."

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **55** *SC* **55.3.2.1** *P* **69** *L* **16** # **367**
Brown, Benjamin AMCC

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

More guidance is necessary on the causes of Local and Remote Link Faults.

SuggestedRemedy

I don't have ideas for this guidance but I'd be happy to participate in a discussion on this topic.

There appears to be more wording on many of these bits in 55.3.4.1. Perhaps there could be a reference to that section here.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #30.

Cl **55** *SC* **55.3.2.1** *P* **69** *L* **2** # **538**
Richard Brand Nortel Networks

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

Add verbage

SuggestedRemedy

"in the local device transmit direction in any of the subordinate sublayers (e.g. MAC control, MAC, Physical). Depending on the nature of the fault, the OAMPDU may or may not successfully transit those sublayers to the link."

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Same as comment #28.

Cl **55** *SC* **55.3.2.1** *P* **69** *L* **2** # **28**
MARTIN, DAVID NORTEL NETWORKS

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

Could use some clarifying text regarding the potential source of the fault and the fact that the fault may preclude successful transmission of the OAMPDU.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "in the local device" => "in the local device transmit direction in any of the subordinate sublayers (e.g. MAC control, MAC, Physical). Depending on the nature of the fault, the OAMPDU may or may not successfully transit those sublayers to the link."

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **55** *SC* **55.3.2.1** *P* **69** *L* **5** # **540**
Richard Brand Nortel Networks

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

Add words

SuggestedRemedy

To read "has been detected remotely in the receive direction of the subordinate sublayers (e.g. MAC control, MAC, Physical)."

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #412.

Cl **55** *SC* **55.3.2.1** *P* **69** *L* **5** # **29**

MARTIN, DAVID NORTEL NETWORKS

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

Could use some clarifying text on the potential location of the fault.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "has been detected remotely." => "has been detected remotely in the receive direction of the subordinate sublayers (e.g. MAC control, MAC, Physical)."

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #412.

Cl **55** *SC* **55.3.2.1** *P* **69** *L* **7** # **686**

Squire, Matt Hatteras Networks

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

The loopback flag is unclear. How is it used? More detail needs to be provided somewhere. The flag seems to conflict with the Loopback PDU of section 55.3.3.4. Also, the alarm flag is confusing as well. Under what circumstances is it set and cleared? Is there a MIB variable to which it is tied?

SuggestedRemedy

Need to clarify loopback operation and alarm flag operation. No good short suggestion.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **55** *SC* **55.3.2.1** *P* **69** *L* **9** # **20**

MARTIN, DAVID NORTEL NETWORKS

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

Clarification

SuggestedRemedy

Change "indicates an unrecoverable failure condition" => "indicates an unrecoverable local failure condition"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **55** *SC* **55.3.2.1** *P* **69** *L* **9** # **539**

Richard Brand Nortel Networks

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

Add word "local"

SuggestedRemedy

To read "indicates an unrecoverable local failure condition"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

See comment #20.

Cl **55** *SC* **55.3.2.1(a)** *P* **69** *L* **1** # **411**

Arnold, Brian Cisco Systems

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

The meaning of Local Link Fault (LLF) in the Flags field could be clearer. Suggested replacement or additional text below.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace the current text:

"This flag indicates that a link fault has been detected in the local device."

with the following:

"This flag indicates the local device's transmit path is impaired."

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **55** *SC* **55.3.2.1(b)** *P* **69** *L* **4** # **412**

Arnold, Brian Cisco Systems

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

The meaning of Remote Link Fault (RLF) in the Flags field could be clearer. Suggested replacement or additional text below.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace the current text:

"This flag indicates that a link fault has been detected remotely."

with the following:

"This flag indicates the local device is experiencing a receive path error."

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **55** *SC* **55.3.3.1** *P* **70** *L* # **543**

Richard Brand — Nortel Networks

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

Change paragraph

SuggestedRemedy

The OAM Status PDU is a misnomer, and also has three classes of information mixed together: state, configuration, and capability. This PDU should be split/renamed into three PDUs as follows:

'OAM State PDU' [0x00]
Retain the Local_State field where:
D7 = 'In Service' which is true when '1', false when '0', set by STA
D6 = 'In Loopback' which is logically equal to the Loopback flag indication

'OAM Configuration PDU' [0x01]
Retain the Local_OAMPDU_Configuration field as is.
Retain the Local_Loopback_Configuration field but with bit D7 as undefined.
Retain the Local_Extension field as is.

'OAM Capability PDU' [0x02]
Retain the Local_OAM_Configuration field but renamed as Local_OAM_Capability with
D7 = 'US' as currently defined
D6 = 'LS' as currently defined in bit D7 of the Local_Loopback_Configuration field.

The Far End fields should be split in the same manner.

Figures 55-9, 55-10, 55-11, 55-13 should be revised accordingly.

It is suggested that the other OAMPDU codes be incremented by 2.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

Would prefer to defer this to OAM STF meetings in New Orleans. The number, content and format of the Capability Discovery related OAMPDUs need to be decided in conjunction with the state machine and protocol.

Cl **55** *SC* **55.3.3.1** *P* **70** *L* **11** # **421**

Daines, Kevin — World Wide Packets

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

Usage of "? OAMPDU", "OAM ? PDU", "? PDU". Not consistent through clause.

SuggestedRemedy

Make consistent. Consider using "? OAMPDU" throughout.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **55** *SC* **55.3.3.1** *P* **70** *L* **12** # **31**

MARTIN, DAVID — NORTEL NETWORKS

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

General comment on the contents of the OAM Status PDU. The OAM Status PDU is first a misnomer, and second has three classes of information mixed together: state, configuration, and capability. Those classes of information are in general handled by different processes. Having the information in the same PDU requires each process to parse what it's after. To eliminate or at least simplify that step, the OAM Status PDU should be split / renamed into three PDUs as described below.

SuggestedRemedy

The OAM Status PDU should be split / renamed into three PDUs as described below:

OAM State PDU [0x00]
TLV_type = Local_State
Local_State_Length = 0x14
Retain the Local_State field where:
D7 = 'In Service' which is true when '1', false when '0', set by STA
D6 = 'In Loopback' which is logically equal to the Loopback flag indication
D5-D0 = undefined as currently captured
The following 12 octets are set to 'local_state_placeholder'.
The Far End fields should be arranged similarly.

OAM Configuration PDU [0x01]
TLV_type = Local_Configuration
Local_Configuration_Length = 0x14
Retain the Local_OAMPDU_Configuration field as is.
Retain the Local_Loopback_Configuration field with:
D7 = undefined
D6-D0 = Loopback_Timeout as currently captured.
Retain the Local_Extension field as is.
Set the Local_State and Local_OAM_Configuration fields to 'local_configuration_placeholder'
The Far End fields should be arranged similarly.

OAM Capability PDU [0x02]
TLV_type = Local_Capability
Local_Capability_Length = 0x14
Retain the Local_OAM_Configuration field but renamed as Local_OAM_Capability with:
D7 = 'US' as currently defined
D6 = 'LS' as currently defined in bit D7 of the Local_Loopback_Configuration field
D5-D0 = undefined as currently captured.
Set the Local_State and Local_OAMPDU_Configuration and Local_Loopback_Configuration and Local_Extension fields to 'local_capability_placeholder'
The Far End fields should be arranged similarly.

Figures 55-9, 55-10, 55-11, 55-13 should be revised accordingly.

It is suggested that the other OAMPDU codes be incremented by 2.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

Would prefer to defer this to OAM STF meetings in New Orleans. The number, content and format of the Capability Discovery related OAMPDUs need to be decided in conjunction with the state machine and protocol.

Cl **55** *SC* **55.3.3.1** *P* **70** *L* **12** # **2**

Seyoun LIM SAMSUNG EIECTRO

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

"The OAM status PDU is used to send OAM state information to the far-end device."

The OAM status PDU(v1.0) is combined with Local Status(v0.9) and Far-end Status(v0.9). It should be corrected.

SuggestedRemedy

It would be corrected that "The OAM status PDU is used to send local and far-end OAM state information".

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Cl **55** *SC* **55.3.3.1** *P* **70-74** *L* # **167**

Seyoun LIM SAMSUNG EIECTRO

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

In clause 55, OAM needs to the mechanism to discovery each other OAM capability.
If OLT/ONU have got the different OAM function, they cannot exchange their OAM information and interperte the information from others because OLT/ONU support different OAM function.therefore, the OAM capability discovery mechanism is important to exchange OAM information efficiently.
Through OAM capability discovery, OLT/ONU can set up the OAM function to allow both(OLT/ONU) to support.

SuggestedRemedy

I proposed "OAM capability discovery mechanism" based on 3 way handshaking

1. Definition of three type messages for OAM capability discovery
one. Initiate_OAM_Discovery : this message with OAM capability of OLT is sent from OLT to ONU to initiate OAM capability discovery
two. Report_OAM_Discovery : this message is sent from ONU to OLT to report OAM capability of ONU.
three.Complete_OAM_Discovery : this message is sent from OLT to ONU to complete OAM capability discovery.

2. Additional Field to indicate each message
- the New field is "Capability Discovery state(2 bits)" at Local/Far_End_state
to distinguish each message mentioned above to discovery OAM capability

3. Necessary new timer for reliability : Discovery_timer(discovery_time)
- This timer controls the reception window in OLT/ONU
:An OLT sets Discovery_timer(Discovery_time) as soon as an OLT sends ¡°Initiate_OAM_Discovery¡± to an ONU. ¡°Report_OAM_Discovery¡± is expected to arrive at OLT before Discovery_timer is expired.
However, an OLT decides to retransmit ¡°Initiate_OAM_Discovery¡± if Discovery_timer is expired before Report_OAM_Discovery arrival.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

Would prefer to defer this to OAM STF meetings in New Orleans. The number, content and format of the Capability Discovery related OAMPDUs need to be decided in conjunction with the state machine and protocol.

Cl **55** *SC* **55.3.3.1** *P* **71** *L* **18** # **712**

Jonathan Thatcher World Wide Packets

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

Local_placeholder makes no sense.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove, describe, or add explanation (as editors note?)

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **55** *SC* **55.3.3.1** *P* **71** *L* **25** # **711**

Jonathan Thatcher World Wide Packets

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

Use of term "Far_End" not consistent with other usage within document.

SuggestedRemedy

Global replacement of "Far_End" with "Remote"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **55** *SC* **55.3.3.1** *P* **71** *L* **45** # **710**

Jonathan Thatcher World Wide Packets

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

Not clear what the purpose of the Far End TLV is.

SuggestedRemedy

Add brief description in 55.3.3.1 for the intent/purpose of the two TLV types

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **55** *SC* **55.3.3.1** *P* **71-73** *L* **Figure 55-** # **1**

Seyoun LIM SAMSUNG ElECTRO

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

In the figure 55-9, OAM status PDU data field is defined below.
Local_State is 2 octets, Local_OAM_Configuration is 2 octets, Local_OAMPUD_Configuration, and Local_Loopback_Configuration is 2 octets.
However these fields are described differently.
these field are described below.
Local_state is 1 octet, Local_OAM_Configuration is 1 octet, Local_OAMPDU_Configuration is 4 octets, and Local_Loopback_Configuration is 1 octet.
compare the list, c),d),e) and f) with Figure 55-9.

SuggestedRemedy

I think the figure should be corrected as these fields are described at c),d),e) and f).
the corrected is below.

Local_State : 2 octets -> 1 octet
Local_OAM_Configuration : 2 octets -> 1 octet
Local_OAMPDU_Configuration : 2 octets -> 4 octets
Local_Loopback_Configuration : 2 octets -> 1 octets

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Cl **55** *SC* **55.3.3.1** *P* **72** *L* **28** # **136**

Daines, Kevin World Wide Packets

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

Text incorrectly states Local_Configuration field is two octets in length. Should be four.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "two" to "four".

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Cl **55** *SC* **55.3.3.1** *P* **72** *L* **28** # **151**

Aoki, Yasuhide NTT

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

"This field is two octets in length and shall be as shown in Figure 55-12." should be changed into "four octets".

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **55** *SC* **55.3.3.1** *P* **72** *L* **47** # **371**

Brown, Benjamin AMCC

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

Is a Passive Mode device allowed to transmit a Loopback Control OAMPDU

SuggestedRemedy

Add Loopback Control to the list of disallowed OAMPDUs for Passive Mode devices.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **55** *SC* **55.3.3.1** *P* **72** *L* **49** # **372**
Brown, Benjamin AMCC

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**
Bullet numbering is wrong

SuggestedRemedy
Fix bullet numbering:
1)
i)
ii)
3)
4)

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

This format will change to a tabular style and not have this numbering.

Cl **55** *SC* **55.3.3.1** *P* **72** *L* **51** # **95**
Turner, Ed Lattice Semiconductor

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**
Typo. Two full-stops after 0x5.

SuggestedRemedy
Delete one of the full-stops.

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

Cl **55** *SC* **55.3.3.1** *P* **72** *L* **51** # **373**
Brown, Benjamin AMCC

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**
2 periods

SuggestedRemedy
remove one of them

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

Cl **55** *SC* **55.3.3.1** *P* **73** *L* **21** # **544**
Richard Brand Nortel Networks

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **D**
Add verbage

SuggestedRemedy
To read: " value in seconds (range from 0-128 seconds)."

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

See comment #32.

Cl **55** *SC* **55.3.3.1** *P* **73** *L* **21** # **32**
MARTIN, DAVID NORTEL NETWORKS

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **D**
Should specify the value range for the Loopback_Timeout.

SuggestedRemedy
Change "value in seconds." => "value in seconds (range from 0-128 seconds)."

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

Cl **55** *SC* **55.3.3.1** *P* **73** *L* **22** # **375**
Brown, Benjamin AMCC

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **D**
What is the quantum for the Loopbac Timeout field?

SuggestedRemedy
Create a loopback timeout quantum value for the values in this field.

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

See response to comment #544, #32.

Cl **55** *SC* **55.3.3.1** *P* **73** *L* **44** # **71**

Turner, Ed — Lattice Semiconductor

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

No need for the text '.. to claim compliance with Version 1 of this protocol.' since there is a 'shall' statement at the start of the sentence.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete the text highlighted above so that the sentence reads : 'They shall be ignored on receipt and shall be transmitted as zeroes.'
You could also delete the second shall to save a PICS entry.
Also apply this modification to point p) on the next page (p74, line 3).

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **55** *SC* **55.3.3.1** *P* **73** *L* **50** # **376**

Brown, Benjamin — AMCC

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

bad numbers

SuggestedRemedy

replace "20 (0x14)" with "22 (0x16)"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **55** *SC* **55.3.3.1** *P* **73** *L* **78** # **374**

Brown, Benjamin — AMCC

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

Fix the wording

SuggestedRemedy

Replace: "The Configuration field" with "This field"
Replace "operation of OAM." with "operation of OAM loopback."
replace "The Configuration field" with "The Local_Loopback_Configuration field"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **55** *SC* **55.3.3.1** *P* **74** *L* **15** # **132**

Daines, Kevin — World Wide Packets

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

Negotiation/Capability Discovery mechanism not incorporated into D1.0. Presentation will be given in OAM Track in New Orleans.

SuggestedRemedy

Adopt presentation and incorporate into D1.1.

Resolves Editor's Note on page 74, line 15 and second half of Editor's Note on page 83, line 6.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **55** *SC* **55.3.3.1** *P* **74** *L* **5** # **377**

Brown, Benjamin — AMCC

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

Add a "When Sent" section

SuggestedRemedy

Indicate that the OAM Status PDU is only sent during negotiation

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Referred to now as capability discovery.

Cl **55** *SC* **55.3.3.2** *P* **74** *L* **1823** # **378**

Brown, Benjamin — AMCC

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

Keep Alive isn't necessary

SuggestedRemedy

Remove this OAMPDU

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Keep Alive won't stay alive.

Cl **55** *SC* **55.3.3.2 and 56.3.4** *P* **74 and 122** *L* # **166**

Jin Kim Samsung

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

It is important to provide the fairness between user stations.
The current REPORT message only reports total queue size in ONU, and which can not guarantee the fairness.

One way of doing this is ONU provides to OLT how many user stations are currently active.

SuggestedRemedy

There are two possibile ways.
1) Use 2 bytes in the current MPCP REPORT message for the ONU¡¯s active user station number.
2) Use 2 bytes in the current OAM Keep Alive message for the ONU¡¯s active user station number.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.

Clause 55 will be kept media/topology independent. As such, the commenter should pursue the first suggested remedy with the P2MP STF.

Note: The EFM OAM Editor copied the P2MP Chair and Editor on this comment, as the comment sort likely didn't parse the dual sub-clauses and page numbers.

Cl **55** *SC* **55.3.3.3** *P* **74** *L* **28** # **22**

MARTIN, DAVID NORTEL NETWORKS

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

Typo

SuggestedRemedy

Change "in 55.3.3.4" => "in 55.3.4"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **55** *SC* **55.3.3.3** *P* **74** *L* **28** # **545**

Richard Brand Nortel Networks

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

incorrect reference

SuggestedRemedy

Should read "in 55.3.4"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Same as #22.

Cl **55** *SC* **55.3.3.3** *P* **74** *L* **30** # **379**

Brown, Benjamin AMCC

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

Add a "When Sent" section

SuggestedRemedy

Indicate that the Event Notification PDU is sent only outside of negotiation and whenever a bit in the flags field changes state (including entering and leaving loopback mode)

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **55** *SC* **55.3.3.4** *P* **74** *L* **48** # **33**

MARTIN, DAVID NORTEL NETWORKS

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

The text further down in lines 52-54 would be better located following item 2).

SuggestedRemedy

Change "a 0 is encoded." => "a 0 is encoded. A zero encoding signifies the local device wishes to enable far-end loopback mode until a subsequent Loopback Control PDU with LME=0 is sent to disable it."

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **55** *SC* **55.3.3.4** *P* **74** *L* **48** # **546**

Richard Brand Nortel Networks

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

Add verbage

SuggestedRemedy

To read: "a 0 is encoded. A zero encoding signifies the local device wishes to enable far-end loopback mode until a subsequent Loopback Control PDU with LME=0 is sent to disable it."

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

See comment #33.

Cl **55** *SC* **55.3.3.4** *P* **74** *L* **50** # **708**

Jonathan Thatcher World Wide Packets

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

There is no indication whether OAM frames should be sent to the OAM Control block while in loopback. Neither is there any clear indication in Figure 55-5 what happens to incoming frames when in loopback. Ditto other state diagrams.
Similarly, it is not clear if the remote side can transmit OAMPDUs while in loopback.

SuggestedRemedy

Fix.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Cl **55** *SC* **55.3.3.4** *P* **74** *L* **51** # **547**

Richard Brand Nortel Networks

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

Delete text "A non-zero encoding signifies the duration of the loopback. A zero encoding signifies the local device wishes to enable far-end loopback mode until a subsequent Loopback Control PDU is sent to disable it."

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **55** *SC* **55.3.3.4** *P* **74** *L* **51** # **709**

Jonathan Thatcher World Wide Packets

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

It is not likely that all loopback tests can be accomplished before loopback timeout occurs. Example, if someone wanted to validate a 10-12 BER, this would take on the order of 15 minutes, not 8 seconds.

SuggestedRemedy

Either:
1. Modify to allow refresh of the loopback timeout during the course of the loopback. Verify that this does not cause problems with the parser and state machines (recommended) or,
2. Increase the number of bits supporting the timeout value or,
3. Increase the interval.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **55** *SC* **55.3.3.4** *P* **74** *L* **51** # **34**

MARTIN, DAVID NORTEL NETWORKS

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

This text is now redundant given my previous comment.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete the following text: "A non-zero encoding signifies the duration of the loopback. A zero encoding signifies the local device wishes to enable far-end loopback mode until a subsequent Loopback Control PDU is sent to disable it."

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **55** *SC* **55.3.3.4** *P* **75** *L* **310** # **380**

Brown, Benjamin AMCC

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

Responses to some of the Editor's notes

SuggestedRemedy

Question 1:
Use an Event Notification PDU anytime any of the flag fields change state, including entering and leaving loopback mode

Question 2:
When there's a conflict, the OLT (active device) always wins and the ONU (passive device) always loses. If both devices are active, as they may be when an installer is at the customer premise and needs to perform some diagnostics back to the OLT, then the OLT still wins.

Another option is that "management knows all" and it just won't happen (i.e., ignore it!)

Question 3:
OAMPDUs are never looped back. If the active device has set the passive device in loopback and the active device detects an OAMPDU from the passive device, it knows it originated at the passive device and the active device should respond to it as it would react to an OAMPDU any other time.

Question 4:
Again, use Event Notification to report that you're no longer in loopback mode.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **55** *SC* **55.3.3.5** *P* **75** *L* **15** # **125**

Daines, Kevin World Wide Packets

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

Passive mode seems wrong here.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to active mode.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Same as comment #36.

Cl **55** *SC* **55.3.3.5** *P* **75** *L* **15** # **35**

MARTIN, DAVID NORTEL NETWORKS

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

Need to maintain consistent naming convention for the OAMPDUs.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "upon reception of a Generate Ping PDU." => "upon reception of a Ping Request PDU."

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **55** *SC* **55.3.3.5** *P* **75** *L* **15** # **548**

Richard Brand Nortel Networks

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

Change verbage

SuggestedRemedy

To read: "upon reception of a Ping request PDU."

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Same as comment #127.

Cl **55** *SC* **55.3.3.5** *P* **75** *L* **15** # **152**

Aoki, Yasuhide NTT

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

"A device must be in passive mode to transmit Ping Requests."should be changed into"active mode".

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Same as comment #36.

Cl **55** *SC* **55.3.3.5** *P* **75** *L* **15** # **127**

Daines, Kevin World Wide Packets

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

"Generate Ping" should be "Ping Request"

SuggestedRemedy

Change "Generate Ping" to "Ping Request"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **55** *SC* **55.3.3.5** *P* **75** *L* **15** # **126**

Daines, Kevin World Wide Packets

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

Passive and active mode need to be defined. Note: passive and active mode was chosen over individual enables for each OAMPDU.

SuggestedRemedy

Define active and passive mode. Resolves portion of Editor's Note found on page 70, line 6.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **55** *SC* **55.3.3.5** *P* **75** *L* **16** # **549**
Richard Brand Nortel Networks

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **D**
Change verbage

SuggestedRemedy
To read: "must be in active mode to transmit."

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

Same as comment #36.

Cl **55** *SC* **55.3.3.5** *P* **75** *L* **16** # **36**
MARTIN, DAVID NORTEL NETWORKS

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **D**
Must be in Active Mode to generate a Ping Request PDU.

SuggestedRemedy
Change "must be in passive mode to transmit" => "must be in active mode to transmit"

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

Cl **55** *SC* **55.3.3.5** *P* **75** *L* **16** # **381**
Brown, Benjamin AMCC

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**
wrong word - I'm going to assume typo rather than actual technical mistake

SuggestedRemedy
replace "passive" with "active"

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

Technically, it was a copy-paste error.

Same as comment #36.

Cl **55** *SC* **55.3.3.6** *P* **75** *L* **21** # **37**
MARTIN, DAVID NORTEL NETWORKS

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **D**
Should ensure it's clear which end responds with a Ping Response PDU.

SuggestedRemedy
Change "The far-end shall transmit" => "An end station shall transmit"

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

Cl **55** *SC* **55.3.3.6** *P* **75** *L* **21** # **550**
Richard Brand Nortel Networks

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **D**
Change verbage

SuggestedRemedy
To read: "The local end shall transmit."

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

Same as comment #37.

Cl **55** *SC* **55.3.3.6** *P* **75** *L* **23** # **382**
Brown, Benjamin AMCC

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **D**
If the data field's match, won't the lengths match?

SuggestedRemedy
change "data field and length shall" to "data field shall"

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

Cl **55** *SC* **55.3.3.7** *P* **75** *L* **24** # **137**
Daines, Kevin World Wide Packets

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **D**
Device must be in active mode to source Variable Request PDUs.

SuggestedRemedy
Add passive mode to description, similar to 55.3.3.5 (once fixed :)

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

Cl **55** *SC* **55.3.4** *P* **75** *L* **43** # **142**

Daines, Kevin World Wide Packets

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

Text loosely defines the required response time for replying to a Variable Request. However, it implies the response is required to be the next frame/packet by saying the next available transmission cycle. Note that the definition for a Variable Response, 55.3.3.8, does not even mention a response time.

SuggestedRemedy

Add response time to 55.3.3.8

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Cl **55** *SC* **55.3.4** *P* **75** *L* **51** # **141**

Daines, Kevin World Wide Packets

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

Minimum Frame Periodicity is incorrect. Should read Minimum Frame Rate.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "Periodicity" to "Rate".

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **55** *SC* **55.3.4** *P* **75** *L* **52** # **551**

Richard Brand Nortel Networks

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

Change verbage

SuggestedRemedy

To read: "An asynchronous event message shall use the Event Notification PDU, defined in 55.3.3.3, when no other OAMPDU is being sourced. If another OAMPDU is currently being sourced, then only the Flags Field indications are available."

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Same as comment #38.

Cl **55** *SC* **55.3.4** *P* **75** *L* **53** # **38**

MARTIN, DAVID NORTEL NETWORKS

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

It isn't clear that the Flag indications are to be set regardless of which OAMPDU is in the transmit pipeline. Only if the transmit pipe is currently empty can the Event Notification PDU be sent (and with more details in its data field).
The last portion of the sentence regarding the Alarm Indication Flag is redundant.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "An asynchronous event message shall use the Event Notification PDU, defined in 55.3.3.3, and, when no other corresponding Flag applies, must raise the Alarm Indication Flag defined in 55.3.4.1." => "An asynchronous event message shall use the Event Notification PDU, defined in 55.3.3.3, when no other OAMPDU is being sourced. If another OAMPDU is currently being sourced, then only the Flags Field indications are available."

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **55** *SC* **55.3.4** *P* **75** *L* **54** # **96**

Turner, Ed Lattice Semiconductor

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

Section 13.1 of the IEEE style guide prohibits the use of the word 'must' for mandatory behavior.

SuggestedRemedy

In this case, there is a 'shall' at the start of the sentence so you can delete 'must'. In other cases you may have to replace 'must' with 'shall'.
Section 55.3.4.1 has multiple instances of 'must' that need treatment. Delete or replace any other occurances of 'must' throughout this clause.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **55** *SC* **55.3.4.1** *P* **76** *L* **34** # **140**

Daines, Kevin World Wide Packets

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

Error Rate as currently constituted conveys code violations only. What about bit errors that don't cause code violations but still cause CRC errors? Is the intent to capture errored-seconds regardless of data rate?

SuggestedRemedy

Revisit the ER definition. Consider changing it to include CRC errors.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Ben Brown to present discussion on this topic during the OAM STF meetings.

Cl **55** *SC* **55.3.4.1** *P* **76** *L* **6** # **39**

MARTIN, DAVID NORTEL NETWORKS

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

This entire section is redundant (lines 6-43). The Flag indications are described in 55.3.2.1. Any more detail on them should be in that sub-clause.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete the sub-section portion from line 6 through to line 26 to the end of the sentence "while the condition persists." Move the remainder of the sub-section from line 26 beginning with "It is recommended that" through to line 42 and put it following p.69, line 14.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **55** *SC* **55.3.4.1** *P* **76** *L* **6** # **687**

Arnold, Brian Cisco Systems

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

There perhaps ought to be a new section (55.3.4.2?) to discuss events and alarms in the context of PHY-layer loop aggregated links, as with copper. Certain of the alarms and events, namely LLF, RLF, and AI (possibly relevant to all of TE, ER, PV, VSA, and VS), contain incomplete information when passed across an aggregated link. For instance, if an OAM sublayer receives an OAMPDU with the RLF flag or an RLF event, over a non-aggregated (single) link, there is enough information for the receiving OAM sublayer to act upon, if action is desired. If it happens to be a link with four aggregated pairs (for instance), the OAM sublayer won't necessarily know which pair(s) the RLF pertains to, and OAM then cannot complete the scope of OAM as in "...quickly determine the location of failing links or fault conditions." from 55.1.1.

SuggestedRemedy

There are at least a couple of choices to remedy: specify the additional required content of OAMPDUs when one of these events is triggered over a PHY-layer aggregated link, or specify the additional information to be subsequently queried by an OAM sublayer receiving one of these events over a PHY-layer aggregated link.

In either case, the information carried in OAMPDUs ought to be closely coordinated with the Copper STF's proposed PHY-layer loop aggregation techniques.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Agree that PHY-layer loop aggregated links are fairly unique in the 802.3 family of links. Need to determine the best way to support these links. Suspect this will be one of the topics of the joint OAM/Copper session.

Cl **55** *SC* **55.3.4.1** *P* **76** *L* **6** # **552**

Richard Brand Nortel Networks

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

Delete entire subsection and move lines 26-42 to follow p.69, line 14.

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #39.

Cl **55** *SC* **55.3.4.1(d)** *P* **76** *L* **24** # **408**

Arnold, Brian Cisco Systems

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

The text mentions the purpose of the Alarm Indication event for conditions where no Flag applies. It may also be the case that more than one Flag applies to the current condition. The OAMPDU with the Alarm Indication event may then be used to contain the supplemental event information as described later in the text. The supplemental information can then be used to sort out any ambiguity.

SuggestedRemedy

Two choices:

a) insert the word "single" in the phrase "...condition to which no Flag applies.", so that it reads "...condition to which no single Flag applies."

- or -

b) rephrase the same sentence fragment thusly: "...condition to which no Flag applies or to which multiple Flags apply."

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Propose use of remedy (b).

Cl **55** *SC* **55.3.4.a** *P* **75** *L* **48** # **707**

Jonathan Thatcher World Wide Packets

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

It is not at all clear what "immediately communicate" means. It needs to be decided if a "dying gasp" in particular has precedent over a frame currently being sent out the port.

SuggestedRemedy

Detail intent. Either:
1. Immediately following the packet/frame currently being sent, or
2. Terminate the packet/frame currently being sent and ship the event.

Also make it clear if any OAMPDUs previously scheduled should be delayed until after the even notification or modified to update the flags, etc.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Cl **55** *SC* **55.3.5.1** *P* **77** *L* **1** # **23**

MARTIN, DAVID NORTEL NETWORKS

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

Typo

SuggestedRemedy

Change "The Varaible Branch field" => "The Variable Branch field"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **55** *SC* **55.3.5.1** *P* **77** *L* **1** # **553**

Richard Brand Nortel Networks

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

"Varaible" misspelled

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Same as comment #23.

Cl **55** *SC* **55.3.5.1** *P* **77** *L* **1** # **130**

Daines, Kevin World Wide Packets

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

"Branch" and "Leaf" definitions could be clearer.

SuggestedRemedy

Better explain branches and leaves.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Will poll the STF to see if Branch/Leaf descriptions are sufficient. Some in the past have been confused.

Cl **55** *SC* **55.3.5.1** *P* **77** *L* **6** # **554**

Richard Brand Nortel Networks

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

Delete text "Examples of Variable Descriptors are shown in Table 55-3"

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Same as comment #24.

Cl **55** *SC* **55.3.5.1** *P* **77** *L* **6** # **24**

MARTIN, DAVID NORTEL NETWORKS

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

Redundant sentence

SuggestedRemedy

Delete "Examples of Variable Descriptors are shown in Table 55-3." since a similar yet more accurate sentence is below Fig.55-16 in line 17.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **55** *SC* **55.3.5.2** *P* **77** *L* **27** # **139**
Daines, Kevin World Wide Packets

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**
Typo. "Variable Length" should read "Variable Leaf"

SuggestedRemedy
Change "Length" to "Leaf"

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

Cl **55** *SC* **55.3.5.2** *P* **77** *L* **28** # **153**
Aoki, Yasuhide NTT

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**
"The variable Length field is derived from the registration arcs in Annex 30A.CROSS REF."should be changed into "The variable Leaf field".

SuggestedRemedy

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

Same as comment #139

Cl **55** *SC* **55.3.6.1** *P* **78** *L* **30** # **25**
MARTIN, DAVID NORTEL NETWORKS

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**
Pagination

SuggestedRemedy
Add required page break to keep Table 55-3 intact with the remainder on page 79.

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

Cl **55** *SC* **55.3.6.1** *P* **78** *L* **Table 55-3** # **555**
Richard Brand Nortel Networks

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**
Table split

SuggestedRemedy

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

Same as comment #25.

Cl **55** *SC* **55.3.6.2** *P* **79** *L* **27** # **129**
Daines, Kevin World Wide Packets

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**
References to the registration arcs within Annex 30A can be provided for clarity.

SuggestedRemedy
Add references to the examples provided.

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

Cl **55** *SC* **55.3.6.3** *P* **80** *L* **4** # **72**
Turner, Ed Lattice Semiconductor

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**
IEEE style guide requires that numbers do not have commas.

SuggestedRemedy
Change '19,088,743' to '19 088 743'.

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

Cl **55** *SC* **55.5.2.2** *P* **85** *L* **24** # **131**
Daines, Kevin World Wide Packets

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **D**
PICS not completed for D1.0.

SuggestedRemedy
Complete for D1.1

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

Cl **55** *SC* **Figure 55.2** *P* **60** *L* **1** # **680**
Squire, Matt Hatteras Networks

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **D**
Since we have a requirement for an "oam channel", we probably need a new MAC primative that higher layers can use to send data in the OAM channel.

SuggestedRemedy
Create a new OAM primative for data sent over the OAM channel.

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

Cl **55** *SC* **Figure 55.6** *P* **67** *L* # **685**

Squire, Matt — Hatteras Networks

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

I don't understand the figure. What's INSPECT? Whats NTT?

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

This will be addressed in conjunction with the capability discovery work forthcoming.

Cl **55** *SC* **Figure 55-10, 55.3.3.1(c** *P* **72** *L* **1** # **410**

Arnold, Brian — Cisco Systems

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

The text seems to indicate that one bit maps to one state, and that no more than one bit would be asserted at any time. This creates a hard limit of 8 unique states (not counting all ones and all zeros), and can cause ambiguity if more than one bit is accidentally set or perceived as being set.

SuggestedRemedy

Alter the representation of state, using unique numeric values for unique states, instead of bit fields.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **55** *SC* **Figure 55-18** *P* **79** *L* **47** # **422**

Daines, Kevin — World Wide Packets

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

Data field range should reflect minimum to maximum range (64-1518 octets.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "105-1495" to "41-1495". Repeat for Figures 55-19, 55-20 and 55-21.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **55** *SC* **Figure 55-18** *P* **79** *L* **51** # **128**

Daines, Kevin — World Wide Packets

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

"null" should probably read "null + pad"

SuggestedRemedy

Add "+ pad" to "null" in Figures 55-18, 55-19, 55-20, 55-21

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **55** *SC* **Figure 55-2** *P* **60** *L* # **165**

Jin Kim — Samsung

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

Due to location of OAM layer and the primitive it uses, there are two general issues.
1) When PAUSE is received, OAM can not be transmitted.
2) MPCP can not support the unidirectional operation.

SuggestedRemedy

In my opinion, EPON and OAM STF need to discuss about whether EPON will support the unidirectional operation and PAUSE operation.

If EPON decides to support them, then one way of resolving both issues is using a different primitive from MA_DATA fro OAM.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

...the fact that there are two issues: PAUSE and unidirectional operation. P2MP STF, to this point, has assumed support for PAUSE as mandatory. The OAM STF has specifically included text (see 55.1.6.3) discouraging PAUSE use with OAM.

Please note:
With 20km GbE links, 802.3x PAUSE requires ~60KB buffering at each end of the link to ensure zero data loss and efficient throughput.

Wouldn't P2MP's inherent GATE/REPORT mechanisms provide the needed throttling?

Comment #190 also discussed unidirectional issues w/ P2MP.

Cl **55** *SC* **Figure 55-2** *P* **60** *L* **26** # **143**

Daines, Kevin World Wide Packets

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

From Stephen Haddock:
"In the 802.3ae modifications to clause 2 we added the "frame check sequence" field to the MA_DATA definition and also provided information on how to map the MA_DATA service primitive to the MA_UNITDATA and M_UNITDATA service primitives used in the 802.1 standards.

If my recollection is accurate, Figure 43-2 should use MA_DATA and we just missed it during the balloting process."

SuggestedRemedy

Change "MA_UNITDATA" to "MA_DATA" 4x

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **55** *SC* **Figure 55-3** *P* **61** *L* # **361**

Brown, Benjamin AMCC

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

start and end points of dotted lines are vague

SuggestedRemedy

These lines should both start and end at the MAC Client block

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.

The OAM STF discussed various requirements relating to loopback in November of 2001 and January of 2002. Please see squire_2_0102, sub-bullet LB4 which states "All loopback functions must prevent user data from being echoed back to the user."

The interpretation is that "user" implies "MAC Client" regardless of whether the frames are "loopback test frames" or "normal data frames".

Cl **55** *SC* **Figure 55-4** *P* **64** *L* # **363**

Brown, Benjamin AMCC

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

What happens to client frames during loopback? This state machine makes it look like they are ignored. Do they back up in the MAC client?

SuggestedRemedy

Modify the state machine to show they are discarded or add some words to the state machine description to say they back up in the MAC Client.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Propose that they be discarded. Will clarify via state machine.

Cl **55** *SC* **Figure 55-5** *P* **66** *L* # **364**

Brown, Benjamin AMCC

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

Loopback packets are sent to the OAM Control block not to the MAC Client.

SuggestedRemedy

Change transition from PARSE to PASS TO OAM CONTROL from
OAMPDU
to
OAMPDU + oam_lb=TRUE

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **55** *SC* **Figure 55-8** *P* **69** *L* # **368**

Brown, Benjamin AMCC

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

It is not described how this 2-octet field is transmitted. 55.3.1 talks about numbers and addresses. These descriptions worked for LACP as all of their multi-octet fields were carried as unsigned integers. This doesn't work for us as we have multi-octet flag fields.

SuggestedRemedy

Modify 55.3.1 to describe transmission order of fields such as this.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Also, will address bit ordering for new tabular format assuming response to comment #124 is accepted.

Cl **55** *SC* **Figure 55-8** *P* **69** *L* **20** # **124**

Daines, Kevin World Wide Packets

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

Figures plus text could be better represented with a bit table.

SuggestedRemedy

Change Figure 55-8, 55-10, 55-11, 55-12, 55-13, 55-14, 55-15 and the associated textual descriptions with bit tables patterned after Table 22-7.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **55** *SC* **Figure 55-9** *P* **71** *L* # **370**

Brown, Benjamin AMCC

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

Local/Far_End_OAMPDU_Configuration is 4 octets, not 2

SuggestedRemedy

Change Local/Far_End_Status Length values from 0x14 to 0x16
Change table to show that these fields are 4 octets in length.

Change text in bullet b at the bottom of the page:
replace "20 (0x14)" with "22 (0x16)"

Also fix editorial error:
replace "(in octets of this" with "(in octets) of this"

Also, fix bullet e on page 72:
replace "is two octets" with "is four octets"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **55** *SC* **Table 55-1** *P* **69** *L* # **369**

Brown, Benjamin AMCC

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

I thought the Keep Alive OAMPDU was gone

SuggestedRemedy

Remove Keep Alive OAMPDU

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Keep Alive is dead. Couldn't resist.

Since all OAMPDUs carry the flag field (whereas previously they didn't) a dedicated Keep Alive adds little to no value.

Cl **55** *SC* **Table 55-2** *P* **78** *L* **18** # **138**

Daines, Kevin World Wide Packets

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

Reserved field is 7 bits wide and should span 0x07-0x07F.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "3F" to "7F".

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **55** *SC* **Table55-2** *P* **78** *L* **18** # **154**

Aoki, Yasuhide NTT

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

"0x07-3F" should be changed into "0x07-7F".

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Same as comment #138.

Cl **56** *SC* *P* *L* # **529**

McCammon, Kent SBC Technology Reso

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

For P2MP, lack of downstream encryption specification is a concern for use in public switched networks due to a threat from unauthorized user gaining access to traffic to other users.

SuggestedRemedy

Develop a specification for downstream specification of the payload for only P2MP within 802.3

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **56** *SC* *P* *L* # **724**

Sala, Dolors Broadcom

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

This comment will be a recompilation of cites that need to be modified and they are related to the layering description/decision.

SuggestedRemedy

line 33, page 91: I don't undertand why the multiplexer needs to distiguish where the frame was generated. I assume it is related to outside control which will change.

lines 46-48 p 91 needs to go out.
line 7-8 p 92

All OMP interfaces disappear.

p.115 line 18, The Txallow variable controls PDU forwarding in then transmit as well as the control path. Right now it indicates data path only.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **56** *SC* *P* *L* # **728**

Sala, Dolors Broadcom

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

The LLID assigned by the OLT needs to be 15 bits to leave one bit for the mode of operation. Otherwise we need an additional bit in the entire specification. This bit has not been considered any where, neither in clause 56 or clause 57.

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **56** *SC* *P* **103** *L* # **727**

Sala, Dolors Broadcom

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

line 12 p103: As currently defined, it seems that each LLID has a different MAC and the ONU requires as many MAC addresses as LLIDs has. This should not be a requirement. We are still trying to decide how many LLIDs, but if there is more than one it should not be needed a different MAC address for each one. Why is it needed?

p. 104, line 1: The capability _vector approach introduces an interoperability issue. Since state diagrams are defined based on this information, it needs to be specified what the fields are.

section 2.5.1.3: do we need to the level of detail of how states are allocated? If so, we also need the functional description to describe the protocol message exchange. This is so detail that is very difficult to debug the specification.

In this section, the parameters in the service interface need to be match with clause 2.

line 25, p 106 why the indication needs to go to layer management?

line 9, p106, I do not understand teh need of this message. Why does the ONU need to request a discovery window? is this to the OLT? how can it do it?

I have a lot of questions in trying to understand the state diagrams on pages 108-110. It is difficult to put in words. I would like to get some help from the editor to follow them and discuss my questions.

I do not know why the slave needs to state diagrams.

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **56** *SC* *P* **109** *L* # **729**

Sala, Dolors Broadcom

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

The contention resolution includes both mechanisms. This has not been decided yet.

The contention resolution is defining a random delay in quanta units. I think these units are not the same as the duration of hte transmission of the registration packet.

I believe the analysis was made like based on teh fact that the registration process with this random delay it becomes like an slotted system. Looking at the specification now I think it is not.

SuggestedRemedy

So I want to discuss this with Onn again because I think the analysis does not match well with this specification.

In any case I think the two mechanisms are not warrant. But if the group decides to get both, I want to clarify this issue for the specification.

And aside effect of this mechanism is the idle sequence field in register formats. I would recommend using just BEB and avoiding the parameter.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **56** *SC* *P* **87** *L* **34** # **4**

Jaeyeon Song Samsung Electronics

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

The Clause says, " All messages passed between OLTs and ONUs contain timestamps."

SuggestedRemedy

The Clause should be changed as following, " All MPCP messages passed between OLTs and ONUs contain timestamps."

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **56** *SC* **1.1** *P* **88** *L* # **719**

Sala, Dolors Broadcom

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

I think it is important to highlight the following function of the mechanism. It is part of the baseline although right now it is missing in the draft. How to add it is described in separate comments.

m) General emulation filtering at the ONU to support P2PE, single copy broadcast and shared emulation.

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **56** *SC* **1.2** *P* **89** *L* **31** # **720**

Sala, Dolors Broadcom

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

this line defines the protocol as a particular implementation of MAC control. I think this is not a good characterization of what this clause should do. However, I feel that this represents well what it currently contains. In my opinion the MPCP description should focus much more on the message exchanging than the pursing of frames.

I would give specific TR comments where I think it is too specified. In here I would like to suggest some editing comments on how to specify MPCP.

I would suggest

SuggestedRemedy

A possible structure could be to follow the MAC specification this would be:
1.- header formats (specifying the MAC control frames of new messages)
2.- Functional operation
This should be a general description of message exchange and protocol operation. This part is completely missing and some of the details are difficult to follow without it. Through this process the several new MAC control functions should be introduced. These are: 1) gating (including laser control) 2) timestamping; 3) discovery 4) reporting. All the other functions are just passing through information. So they only need to be described functionally (message handshake) I believe.
3.- Procedural model of the new MAC control functions
Following current MAC control specifiation this specification can be different appendixes of clause 31. I think the first two functions above fit very well as appendixes of clause 31. The reporting has two functions the request and ranging. The ranging part will be described in the timestamp mechanism. And the request part is just functional (message exchange). No need to put it in appendix 31. The discovery contains ranging, contention resolution and registration. The registration is functional but the resolution is not. If there is a way to divide the specification it would be useful. The contention resolution should be in appendix 31 and the registration just in described in the functional.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **56** *SC* **1.3** *P* **90** *L* # **721**

Sala, Dolors Broadcom

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

I think figure 56-2 should be eliminated. The blocks described are not existent. The parser/multiplexers blocks as described in here a exactly the same functionality defined in MAC control. This is the parsing of the frame. We should not redefine it. We just want to add functions to MAC control.

these blocks also introduce artificial internal interfaces. We should define the functions as the MAC clause, and PAUSE has with specific parameters.

So if the picture is not shown as currently in the MAC control layer, it will avoid this division.

The basic idea of using MAC control as the basic protocol for MPCP is not to have to redefine the parsing.

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **56** *SC* **2** *P* *L* # **722**

Sala, Dolors Broadcom

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

FIg 56-3 needs to be updated wiht the correct layering. I would recommend to merge to define MPCP as a MAC control layer calling all MAC control functions. Since the multiplexing layer was no introduced yet in here. I think the easier is to just consider the MPCP in a single layer, and this layer is a redefinition of MAC control to support multiple clients. In the layering discussion this is the option that merges mac control and multiplexing layer in one.

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **56** *SC* **2.2** *P* **92** *L* **30** # **725**

Sala, Dolors Broadcom

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

laser control signal cannot go through layer management.

SuggestedRemedy

It has to be similar to the "transmitting" variable in the MAC clause. management is too slow for this function.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **56** *SC* **2.3, and 2.4** *P* *L* # **723**
Sala, Dolors Broadcom

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

I think these two sections should be eliminated they have too much overlap wiht the MAC control definition. And for example explain the gating function separate up to transmit ready.

Where is the variable TxAllowed modified?

The service interface specification (ex page 99) still needs to be matched with the standard clause two.

In this section the subtype is the opcode in mac control, isn't?

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **56** *SC* **2.4.1.4** *P* **98** *L* # **726**
Sala, Dolors Broadcom

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

section 2.4.1.4. why is the number of OMP frames measured? is it for synchronization? if so you may want to define it differently and also teh OLT does not have this restriction, does it?

section 2.5.1.2 p. 102, what is the time_quanta unit? is it defined somewhere?

section 2.7: I would move this description as the first one instead of the multiplexers specification.

p. 118 line 42, MPCPDUs are "MAC control" frames and hence as such they are not tagged frames. If you say they are basic frames they should be able to be tagged, or not prevented to.

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **56** *SC* **2.7** *P* *L* # **730**
Sala, Dolors Broadcom

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

why we cannot assume that the grants arrive in order at the ONU?
This incurs unncessary processing at teh ONU. And anyway, the OLT must guarantee that they do not overlap so there is no extra cost at the OLT to send them in order to a given ONU.

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **56** *SC* **3** *P* *L* # **731**
Sala, Dolors Broadcom

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

the encapsulation of grants in gates is not very efficient.

I think we should consider being able to do
1.- put discovery grants, and normal grants in a single gate.
we need to move the field discovery line 19, p. 120 to a field for a grant. this can be just a bit.
2.- put several grants to different ONUs in a gate (if wanted). It will be rare that the scheduler schedules so much in the future where it can send two grants to the same ONU (unless they go to different LLID).
3.- put several grants to same ONU but different LLID in the same gate.
these two options require the same modification. Add the LLID as a field specified in the grant.

fig 56-20 It seems there is interest in packaging several requests in a report (to represent several queue boundaries). We should allow this. Again, it only requires to add an LLID and possibly a number of reports field.

table 56-4: if the number of LLIDs to register is sent as a parameter I do not undertand why several steps of registration is needed.

The LLIDs/bit mode should be better specified in the formats. For example assigned ports line 51, page 125

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **56** *SC* **56** *P* *L* # **672**

Diab, Wael William — Cisco Systems

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

There is no mention on the constraint for the local time stamping. I believe that there is an inherent assumption that the delay throuh the MAC & Phy is relatively constant. This needs to be explicitly stated in the draft.

SuggestedRemedy

Please add a timing constraint for the time stamping mechanism to eliminate any variability through the MAC and Phy. For instance, a min and max time between processing to trnsmition.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **56** *SC* **56.1.1** *P* **88** *L* **40** # **515**

Bemmel, Vincent — Alloptic

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

The objective to support multiple LLID per physical ONU does not add any value and in contrary introduces many technical flaws.
At the ONU, the LLID should represent nothing more than the ONU_ID.

A presentation will be submitted for discussion.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace:

b) Support multiple LLID per physical ONU

With:

b) Support a single LLID per physical ONU

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **56** *SC* **56.1.2** *P* **89** *L* **38** # **702**

Jonathan Thatcher — World Wide Packets

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

Sentence "Should there be a discrepancy..." is virtually identical to sentence in 56.1.4 line 49.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove redundancy

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **56** *SC* **56.1.3** *P* **90** *L* **39** # **701**

Jonathan Thatcher — World Wide Packets

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

Overloading block diagram makes for less print, but makes the distinction between the RX and TX; and between the ONU and OLT confusing.

SuggestedRemedy

Recommend splitting this block diagram up to make Rx/Tx and associated parser/multiplexer clear (example Figure 55-2). Also show ONU and OLT separately and thereby clear up Report and Gate Processing

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **56** *SC* **56.1.6.3** *P* **6** *L* **44** # **347**

Tom Mathey — Independent

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

Text that restricts use of MAC Control PAUSE or Flow Control when OAM sublayer is present can be removed by modification of MAC Control PAUSE State Diagram for transmit, Fig. 31B-1.

SuggestedRemedy

To the two blocks named "SEND DATA FRAME" and "SEND CONTROL FRAME", add a third block named "SEND OAM FRAME".

Define present transition from block "TRANSMIT READY" to block "SEND CONTROL FRAME" as Control.

Define present tranistion from block "TRANSMIT READY" to block "SEND DATA FRAME" as not Control * Data.

Define new transition from existing block "TRANSMIT READY" to new block "SEND OAM FRAME" as OAM. Logic terms for OAM are: MA_DATA.request(DA, SA, type = 0x88-09, subtype = OAM = 0x03)

Enhance present transition from block "TRANSMIT READY" to block "SEND CONTROL FRAME" as not OAM * Control.

Enhance present transition from block "TRANSMIT READY" to block "SEND DATA FRAME" as not OAM * not Control * Data.

Modify transitions from block "PAUSED" to existing and new blocks in a similar manner.

Comments are welcome as other methods are possible, such as no new block and modify equation for enty into block "SEND DATA FRAME".

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **56** *SC* **56.2** *P* **91** *L* **37** # **700**
Jonathan Thatcher World Wide Packets

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **D**
Terms "Register," "Registration" and "Discovery" are used inconsistently.

SuggestedRemedy
Recommend use of "Registration" only.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **56** *SC* **56.2.1** *P* **91** *L* **53** # **73**
Turner, Ed Lattice Semiconductor

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**
Typo.

SuggestedRemedy
Change 'employes' to 'employs'.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **56** *SC* **56.2.1** *P* **92** *L* **14** # **74**
Turner, Ed Lattice Semiconductor

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**
Typo.

SuggestedRemedy
Change 'assymetrical' to 'asymmetrical'.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **56** *SC* **56.2.2** *P* **92** *L* **29** # **526**
Bemmel, Vincent Alloptic

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**
"lasing" is a typo

SuggestedRemedy
should be "laser"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **56** *SC* **56.2.3** *P* **92** *L* **37** # **699**
Jonathan Thatcher World Wide Packets

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **D**
Why would parsing in the Tx direction be required?

SuggestedRemedy
Fix or clarify.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **56** *SC* **56.2.3.1.2** *P* **93** *L* **41** # **698**
Jonathan Thatcher World Wide Packets

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **D**
Consider this a ER. It is common in 802.3 to set variables to values that have meaning. "true" and "false" are not as good as "on" and "off", respectively

SuggestedRemedy
Global change to LaserControl

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **56** *SC* **56.2.3.1.2** *P* **93** *L* **43** # **191**
OGURA, Yasuo NTT

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**
There is a "the state of the Grant Processing sublayer" .

SuggestedRemedy
I think of that there should be a " the state of the Gate Proccessing sublayer"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **56** *SC* **56.2.3.1.5** *P* **94** *L* **34 - 40** # **163**

Jin Kim — Samsung

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

According to the Clause 2, MA_Control primitive is defined as follow. (pg 36, 37)
MA_CONTROL.request (destination_address, opcode, request_operand_list)
MA_CONTROL.indication (opcode,indication_operand_list)

However, Clasue 56 define MA_Control differently as follow.

MA_CONTROL.request(DA, SA, m_sdu)
MA_CONTROL.indication(DA, SA, m_sdu)

SuggestedRemedy

The Clause 56 MA_Control primitive must be correctly defined as Clause 2.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **56** *SC* **56.2.3.1.6** *P* **95** *L* **13** # **697**

Jonathan Thatcher — World Wide Packets

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

Logic needs to be completely specified. For example, to the left of the "PARSE" block there must be Length_Type == MAC Control and !(subtype in (GATE,REPORT,...

Better to explicitly describe the logic than use "else."

SuggestedRemedy

Scrub and fix all state diagrams

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **56** *SC* **56.2.4** *P* **96** *L* **40** # **75**

Turner, Ed — Lattice Semiconductor

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

I think that what you require here is "its" meaning "belonging to".

SuggestedRemedy

Change "it's" to "its".
Also apply to :
P101, line 29; P102, line 6; P104, line 3; P104, line 10; P106, line 13; P111, line 9; P115, line 20;

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **56** *SC* **56.2.4.1.1** *P* **97** *L* # **659**

Diab, Wael William — Cisco Systems

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

convention not stated
Convention forward referenced to clause 57

SuggestedRemedy

Restate convention in Clause 56

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **56** *SC* **56.2.4.1.6** *P* **figure 56-8** *L* # **737**

Jaeyeon Song — Samsung Electronics

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D** *was previously comment #0*

–1. The draft represents MA_CONTROL.indication(DA, SA, m_sdu) format.

2. In the state PARSE INDICATION, timestamp = m_sdu[0:3], subtype=m_sdu[4], m_sdu=m_sdu[5:50].
Figure says a 'subtype' is Opcode. If it is true, timestamp is in front of Opcode. But, timestamp's location is after Opcode in other part of draft.

SuggestedRemedy

1. However, if following the 802.3 standard, it should be changed to MA_CONTROL.indication(opcode, operand_list).
2. According the number 1 comment, it should be changed as following:
subtype=operand_list[0:1]
timestamp=operand_list[2:5]
operand_list=operand_list[6:50]

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **56** *SC* **56.2.5.1.1** *P* **102** *L* # **660**

Diab, Wael William — Cisco Systems

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

convention not stated
Convention forward referenced to clause 57

SuggestedRemedy

Restate convention in Clause 56

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **56** *SC* **56.2.5.1.1** *P* **102** *L* **1219** # **178**
Bharati, Barnali Wipro Technologies

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

The later part of explanations for constants 'max_register_wait' and 'max_defferral' are same.

SuggestedRemedy

'max_defferral' needs to change.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **56** *SC* **56.2.5.1.2** *P* **102** *L* **24** # **168**
Ikeda, Kiyoshi Matsushita Communic

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

wrong : DEFAULT VALUE : 00-09-89-68(10 miliseconds)

SuggestedRemedy

correct: DEFAULT VALUE : 00-00-00-0A(10 times)

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **56** *SC* **56.2.5.1.2** *P* **103** *L* # **661**
Diab, Wael William Cisco Systems

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

ID definition

Not clear what ID array is from the text

SuggestedRemedy

Pls. provide a definition

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **56** *SC* **56.2.5.1.3** *P* **103** *L* **43** # **76**
Turner, Ed Lattice Semiconductor

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

Typo.

SuggestedRemedy

Change 'uppon' to 'upon'.
Also apply to : P103, line 47; P103, line 53; P104, line 3; P112, line 13; P118, line 29; P118, line 33;

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **56** *SC* **56.2.5.1.5** *P* **105** *L* **36** # **193**
OGURA, Yasuo NTT

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

There is no discription about "MA_Control.request(grant)".

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **56** *SC* **56.2.5.1.5** *P* **105** *L* **42** # **516**
Bemmel, Vincent Alloptic

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

Registration should not have to deal with the number of user ports on the ONU, and should be called only once for an ONU.

SuggestedRemedy

Modify line 42 from:
MA_CONTROL.request(registration, number_of_ports)
to:
MA_CONTROL.request(registration)

Remove lines 43-45:
"This primitive may be called multiple times in order to register additional ports. The registration process requests the network a number of ports as specified in the number_of_ports parameter."

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **56** *SC* **56.2.5.1.5** *P* **106** *L* # **665**
Diab, Wael William Cisco Systems

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

Define the parameters that OMP.request() message takes

SuggestedRemedy

Pls. add definitions for the key parameters used in the state machine

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **56** *SC* **56.2.5.1.5** *P* **106** *L* **1** # **524**
Bemmel, Vincent Alloptic

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

MPCP should not request deregistration of ports

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the definition of MA_CONTROL.request(deregister)

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **56** *SC* **56.2.5.1.5** *P* **106** *L* **24** # **517**
Bemmel, Vincent Alloptic

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

Not clear how the SA_list is used in line 24:

"MA_CONTROL.indicate(in_progress, SA_list)
The service indication issued by the Discovery Process to notify the client and Layer Management that the registration process is in progress.
A list of source MAC addresses associated with the devices attempting to register are provided in the SA_list parameter. "

Isn't this one ONU at a time?

SuggestedRemedy

Please Clarify.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **56** *SC* **56.2.5.1.5** *P* **106** *L* **29** # **518**
Bemmel, Vincent Alloptic

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

Registration should deal with a single LLID only

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed text:

MA_CONTROL.indication(accepted, SA, ID, capability, acknowledged_capability, RTT)
The service indication issued by the Discovery Process to notify the client and Layer Management that the registration process has completed.
The MAC address of the recipricating MAC (ONU address at the OLT, and OLT address at the ONU) is passed in the parameter SA. The LLID allocated to the ONU is passed in the parameter ID. The parameter capability holds the 64 bit vector published by the far end, as well as the 64 bit vector (acknowledged_capability) returned by the far end after the registration completion.
The measured round trip time to/from the ONU is returned in the parameter RTT. RTT is stated in time_quanta units. This parameter holds a valid value only when the invoking Discovery Process is in the OLT (i.e. Master = true).

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **56** *SC* **56.2.5.1.5** *P* **107** *L* # **664**
Diab, Wael William Cisco Systems

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

Define the parameters that OMP.indication() takes

SuggestedRemedy

Add definitions for key parameters in the message such as the flags

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **56** *SC* **56.2.5.1.5** *P* **108** *L* **17** # **519**
Bemmel, Vincent Alloptic

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

Not clear what SA_list represents. Shouldn't this be done one SA at a time?

SuggestedRemedy

Change:
MA_CONTROL.indicate(in_progress, SA_list)

To:
MA_CONTROL.indicate(in_progress, SA)

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **56** *SC* **56.2.5.1.6** *P* **110** *L* **14** # **520**

Bemmel, Vincent Alloptic

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

MPCP should not be burdened with dynamic add/remove of multiple LLIDs/ONU

SuggestedRemedy

Remove destruct_flag and IDs fron OMP.indication(). Remove destruct_flag from ZERO STATE 2 and ARRIVING REGISTER 2

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **56** *SC* **56.2.6** *P* **111** *L* **5** # **523**

Bemmel, Vincent Alloptic

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

The followig statement is not clear...

"The layer will, however, generate report messages autonomously on a periodic fashion, in order to maintain minimal rate OMP message flow, as a network sanity check."

This mechanism is not very clear, since TDMA is inherently scheduled.

SuggestedRemedy

Rephrase/clarify this statement.

Why not use the FORCE_REPORT flag mechanism in periodic GATEs (see also figure 56-15 on page 113)

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **56** *SC* **56.2.6.1.5** *P* **112** *L* **3145** # **674**

Yoshihara, Osamu NTT

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

Modify MA_CONTROL.request() and MA_CONTROL.indication() to accomodate multiple threshold reports.
(I will submit a presentation)

SuggestedRemedy

Change "MA_CONTROL.request(report,valid[8],status[8])" to
"MA_CONTROL.request(report,report_list)".
Add the following statement in Line34,
"The list of queue status reports issued by ONU are passsed in the parameter "report_list" . A queue status report has two members, valid[8] and status[8]."

Change "MA_CONTROL.indication(report,valid[8],status[8]) to
"MA_CONTROL.indication(report,report_list)"
Add the following statement in Line42,
"The list of queue status reports issued by ONU are passsed in the parameter report_list. A queue status report has two members, valid[8] and status[8]."

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **56** *SC* **56.2.6.1.6** *P* **113** *L* **11** # **188**

Bharati, Barnali Wipro Technologies

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

In 'PERIODIC TRANSMISSION' state should there not be a check if variable 'register == true'? So that no report is sent untill registration is complete or if the ONU has been deregistered.

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **56** *SC* **56.2.7.1.2** *P* **115** *L* **12** # **668**

Diab, Wael William Cisco Systems

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

The statement "LaserControl is always true for the OLT" is accurate during operation, however, the OLT should be allowed to shut-down the laser if the port is not in use.

SuggestedRemedy

Reword to "LaserControl is always true for the OLT during operation"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **56** *SC* **56.2.7.1.2** *P* **115** *L* **3846** # **189**
Bharati, Barnali Wipro Technologies

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

Same explanation for 'laser_on_time', IDLE_time and laser_off_time (page 116).

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **56** *SC* **56.2.7.1.2** *P* **115** *L* **41** # **669**
Diab, Wael William Cisco Systems

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

Laser_on_time: The phrase "This value is typically hard coded or sensed through the MDIO interface by higher layers and then set." is too constraining to implementations.

SuggestedRemedy

"This value is typically hard coded or sensed by higher layers and then set."

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **56** *SC* **56.2.7.1.2** *P* **116** *L* **2** # **194**
OGURA, Yasuo NTT

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

About "laser_off_time", there is the same description of "laser_on_time".

SuggestedRemedy

This Description should be started with "This variable holds the time required to terminate the laser."

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **56** *SC* **56.2.7.1.2** *P* **116** *L* **5** # **670**
Diab, Wael William Cisco Systems

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

Laser off time: "This value is typically hard coded or sensed through the MDIO interface by higher layers and then set." is again constraining.

SuggestedRemedy

"This value is typically hard coded or sensed by higher layers and then set."

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **56** *SC* **56.2.7.1.4** *P* **116** *L* **42** # **77**
Turner, Ed Lattice Semiconductor

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

Typo.

SuggestedRemedy

Change 'signaling' to 'signalling'.
Also in line 48.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **56** *SC* **56.25.1.3** *P* **104** *L* **38** # **525**
Bemmel, Vincent Alloptic

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

The standard should not have special functions to register LLIDs subsequent to registration in the discovery process.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the definition of the allocate_id() function lines 38-46

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **56** *SC* **56.3.2** *P* **118** *L* **51** # **671**
Diab, Wael William Cisco Systems

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

Reference Table 56-1— in the opcode definition under d) Opcode.

SuggestedRemedy

and defined in Table 56-1:

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **56** *SC* **56.3.2.d** *P* **18** *L* **51** # **696**
Jonathan Thatcher World Wide Packets

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

Missing reference to Table 56-1.

SuggestedRemedy

Add reference.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **56** *SC* **56.3.3.1** *P* **120** *L* **16** # **694**

Jonathan Thatcher World Wide Packets

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

Under what condition would you send 0 grants? Why send a Gate without a grant? Is the reserved space being used for something that isn't documented?

SuggestedRemedy

?

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **56** *SC* **56.3.3.1** *P* **120** *L* **35** # **197**

OGURA, Yasuo NTT

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

In the description "e)", there is a "IDLE sequence number".

SuggestedRemedy

I think of that it should be a "IDLE sequence counter".

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **56** *SC* **56.3.3.1** *P* **120** *L* **35** # **695**

Jonathan Thatcher World Wide Packets

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

Consider this an ER. Change all references to nanosecond increments to bit times for consistency with remaining document.

SuggestedRemedy

See comment

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **56** *SC* **56.3.3.1 (Gate descripti** *P* **120-121** *L* # **199**

Hidekazu Miyoshi Sumitomo Electric Ind

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

Under the Gate/Report message mechanism defined in draft 1.0, bandwidth assignment loss (sometimes called ³unused slot remainder²) may occur. This is a significant problem to achieve higher utilization. Several mechanisms have been proposed. These are, however, not sufficient for DBAs to achieve higher utilization under certain conditions. That is, a more flexible and prospective mechanism is needed. We propose a new MPCP mechanism by extending the format of the Gate message to distribute ³upper bound² to each ONU. The rationale behind our proposed mechanism is that upper bound should be transferred from OLT to ONU in order to alleviate unbalanced-traffic conditions. In the proposed mechanism, the OLT manages upper bound, and the upper bound is distributed to ONUs via the gate message. Each ONU requests the maximum MAC boundary within the upper bound.

SuggestedRemedy

We propose a new Gate message format in order to convey upper bound information. Two alternatives are proposed.

(Proposal 1)
One bit of the upper bound bit field, which represents the existence of the bound field (also newly proposed), is added in the number of grants field. The bound field consists of two sub-fields, bound bitmap (8 bits) and bound #0, #1, #2, #3, #4, #5, #6, and #7 (16bits each). Bound bitmap indicates the presence of each bound field. Each bound field represents upper bound, and bound #i is associated with queue #i in an ONU.

(Proposal 2)
The basic idea is the same as alternative 1. The major difference is that the meaning of Grant start time (only for grant 2, 3, and 4) is changed. The start time represents time difference from the previous start time, and now each size is reduced to 24 bits. In this proposal, if more than two grants are issued in one Gate message, these grants must be ordered in start time.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **56** *SC* **56.3.4.1** *P* **122** *L* **42** # **673**

Yoshihara, Osamu NTT

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

Allow REPORT format to hold multiple sets of bitmap and queue reports to report various frame boudnaries. These information will be helpful for elaborate scheduling concept. (I will submit a presentation)

SuggestedRemedy

Add the following statement,
"(c) The granulality of Queue #n report is 2 octets."
"(d) A Report frame may hold multiple sets of Report bitmap and Queue #n to report various frame boundaries as an option. "

Change the statement from "7 to 39" to "0 to 39" in Line 46.
Change the Queue#n Report fields from 0/4 octets to 0/2 octets in Figure 56-20 in page 123.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **56** *SC* **56.3.5.1** *P* **124** *L* **14** # **521**

Bemmel, Vincent Alloptic

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

"Subsequent request" and "Destruction" requests are not applicable

SuggestedRemedy

Remove from Table 56-4:

line 14:
"2 = Subsequent registration. This is an attempt to register additional LLIDs."

line 16:
"3 = Destruction. This is a request to destroy the port and free the LLID. Subsequently, the MAC is destroyed."

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **56** *SC* **56.3.5.1** *P* **124** *L* **22** # **78**

Turner, Ed Lattice Semiconductor

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

Style.

SuggestedRemedy

Change 'nano second' to 'ns' as per IEEE style guide.
Also apply to line 24.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **56** *SC* **56.3.5.1** *P* **124** *L* **23** # **198**

OGURA, Yasuo NTT

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

In the description "e)turn off time", the is the same description of "d)turn on time".

SuggestedRemedy

I think of that it should be a "This is an unsigned 32 bit value signifying the time required by the ONU to turn off laser after transmitting valid bits.".

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **56** *SC* **56.3.5.1.d** *P* **124** *L* **21** # **692**

Jonathan Thatcher World Wide Packets

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

ER again. "Turn on time" sounds to similar to "start time".

SuggestedRemedy

Change "Turn on time" to "Turn on delay" and "Turn off time" to "Turn off delay" It will reduce the confusion factor.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **56** *SC* **56.3.6.1** *P* **125** *L* **51** # **691**

Jonathan Thatcher World Wide Packets

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

ER again. "Assigned Ports" might be more clear if it were names "# Assigned Ports" or "No. Assigned Ports" or such.

SuggestedRemedy

See comment

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **56** *SC* **56.3.6.1** *P* **126** *L* **13** # **689**

Jonathan Thatcher World Wide Packets

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

There are a number of references to a phantom "higher-layer-entity" within the clause.

SuggestedRemedy

Unmask the phantom. Describe, reference, or otherwise expose this "entity."

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **56** *SC* **56.3.6.1** *P* **126** *L* **8** # **522**

Bemmel, Vincent — Alloptic

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

"Destruct" does not apply since no dynamic LLID add/remove after registration should be supported

SuggestedRemedy

Remove from table 56-6 line 8:

2 Destruct. This is a request to destroy the port and free the LLID. Subsequently, the MAC is destroyed.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **56** *SC* **56.3.6.1.f++** *P* **126** *L* **25** # **690**

Jonathan Thatcher — World Wide Packets

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

Description of "Assigned Ports List" (per Figure 56-22) is missing.
Also, suggest dropping the "s" off of "Ports" everywhere.

SuggestedRemedy

Add description

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **56** *SC* **56.3.7.1** *P* **128** *L* **33** # **688**

Jonathan Thatcher — World Wide Packets

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

Validation of correct registration is an appropriate goal of the registration process. Registration data sent in the "Registration PDU" should be returned in the "Registration Ack" PDU.

Note, the frequency of registration should not be sufficient to impact overall performance. Saving a few bytes is not worth not being able to validate correct reception.

SuggestedRemedy

Add Capability vector, Assigned port list, etc.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **56** *SC* **56.4** *P* **124** *L* **15** # **693**

Jonathan Thatcher — World Wide Packets

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

ER again. Let's "deregister" the MAC & Port rather than destroy it.
Also in Table 56-4 and Table 56-5...

SuggestedRemedy

See comment

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **56** *SC* **Figure** *P* **95** *L* **1** # **514**

Frazier, Howard — Dominet Systems

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

State machine drawings must follow the conventions described in 21.5

SuggestedRemedy

State transition arrows always leave the bottom and enter the top of the states.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **56** *SC* **Figure** *P* **95** *L* **1** # **513**

Frazier, Howard — Dominet Systems

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

All figures must be drawn in framemaker

SuggestedRemedy

Redraw all figures in framemaker

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **56** *SC* **Figure 56.2.6.5.1.6** *P* **108** *L* # **662**

Diab, Wael William — Cisco Systems

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

own_id definition

This is obvious, but you may want to define own_id before the diagram. Referenced in state SEND_REGISTER_WINDOW

SuggestedRemedy

Pls. provide a definition

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **56** *SC* **Figure 56-5** *P* **95** *L* # **657**

Diab, Wael William — Cisco Systems

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

Parse conditions are ambiguous.

SuggestedRemedy

Conditions rewritten as:
(Length_Type == MAC Control) and (subtype NOT in {GATE, REPORT, REGISTER, REGISTER_REQ, REGISTER_ACK})

(Length_Type == MAC Control) and (subtype in {GATE, REPORT, REGISTER, REGISTER_REQ, REGISTER_ACK})

(Length_Type != MAC Control)

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **56** *SC* **Figure 56.2.5.1.6** *P* **108** *L* **30** # **663**

Diab, Wael William — Cisco Systems

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

(destry_flag) is mis-spelled in CHECK DESTRUCTOR state

SuggestedRemedy

spell as (destroy_flag)

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **56** *SC* **Figure 56-11** *P* **108** *L* # **182**

Bharati, Barnali — Wipro Technologies

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

OMP indication REGISTER_ACK can arrive in the 'INSIDE REGISTER WINDOW' state before timeout of 'register_window_size'. This is missing.

SuggestedRemedy

Arrival of REGISTER_ACK in the 'INSIDE REGISTER WINDOW' state, should trigger a state change to 'COMPLETE DISCOVERY'

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **56** *SC* **Figure 56-11** *P* **108** *L* # **185**

Bharati, Barnali — Wipro Technologies

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

State 'CHECK DESTRUCT ID' can appear before 'INDICATE DEREGISTER', otherwise it might lead to unnecessary indication.

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **56** *SC* **Figure 56-11** *P* **108** *L* # **666**

Diab, Wael William — Cisco Systems

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

In Figure 56-11—Discovery Processing Master State Diagram, the behaviour of receiving a REGISTER_REQ inside and outside the REGISTER WINDOW appears to be identicle

SuggestedRemedy

Discard REGISTER_REQ that are received outside the window.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **56** *SC* **Figure 56-11** *P* **108** *L* **25** # **181**

Bharati, Barnali — Wipro Technologies

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

ONU_timer[SA] can expire in the 'INSIDE REGISTER WINDOW' state.

SuggestedRemedy

On expiry of 'ONU_timer' in state 'INSIDE REGISTER WINDOW', state can change to IDLE state.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **56** *SC* **Figure 56-11** *P* **108** *L* **30** # **183**

Bharati, Barnali — Wipro Technologies

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

If (destruct_flag) is true in 'CHECK DESTRUCTOR' state, OLT needs to send OMP.request (subtype=REGISTER, destruct_flag=true) and also needs to call free_state (MAC) to free the 'state' of that ONU. This is missing

SuggestedRemedy

Rather than going back to 'IDLE' from CHECK DESTRUCT ID, it can transit to 'REGISTER'

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **56** *SC* **Figure 56-11** *P* **108** *L* **35** # **184**

Bharati, Barnali — Wipro Technologies

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

If OTL ever receives an OMP.indication (subtype=REGISTER_REQ, destruct_flag=true, SA=broadcast_ID), OLT need not call END function. As this would require a reset of the state machine.

SuggestedRemedy

OLT can just ignore the indication and transit to 'IDLE' state.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **56** *SC* **Figure 56-11** *P* **108** *L* **44** # **179**

Bharati, Barnali — Wipro Technologies

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

'wait_for_register_ack' is missing from the constants list (56.2.5.1.1)

SuggestedRemedy

This constant is used for setting the ONU_timer[]. It represents the period used for waiting for an acknowlegement from ONU to a REGISTER MPCPDU.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **56** *SC* **Figure 56-11** *P* **108** *L* **45** # **180**

Bharati, Barnali — Wipro Technologies

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

Call to remove_timer (ONU_timer[SA]) after receiving OMP.indication (REGISTER_ACK) is missing. The timer is started at line 45.

SuggestedRemedy

remove_timer (ONU_timer[SA]) can be added in 'COMPLETE DISCOVERY' state.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **56** *SC* **Figure 56-13** *P* **110** *L* # **667**

Diab, Wael William — Cisco Systems

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

ACK state in Figure 56- 13— Discovery Processing Slave State Diagram 2 is cutoff on PDF

SuggestedRemedy

fix formatting of page

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **56** *SC* **Figure 56-13** *P* **110** *L* **15** # **187**

Bharati, Barnali — Wipro Technologies

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

Upon reception of OMP.indication (subtype=REGISTER, destruct_flag=true), transition from 'ARRIVING REGISTER 2' to 'DEREGISTER' state is triggered (see: 2 true). This will send another REGISTER_REQ with destruct_flag set to true, instead of an REGISTER_ACK.

SuggestedRemedy

May create a new state 'DEREGISTER_ACK' and actions in this new states are:
1) OMP.request (SA, DA, subtype=REGISTER_ACK, destruct_flag = true)
2) registered = flase

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **56** *SC* **Figure 56-13** *P* **110** *L* **3145** # **186**

Bharati, Barnali — Wipro Technologies

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

Actions in both 'ACK' and 'SUBSEQUENT ACK' states are same.

SuggestedRemedy

There is no need for two different states. State 'SUBSEQUENT ACK' can be removed.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **56** *SC* **Figure 56-19** *P* **121** *L* **16** # **3**

Tomita, shuzo — NTT

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

There is different GATE MPCPDU frame format.
In plenaly(May,2002),"DA/SA/.../Flag/#Start time/#Length/...".
But in Draft 1.0,"DA/SA/.../Flag/#Length/#Start time/..."

I think that plenaly's(May,2002) GATE MPCPDU frame is better.

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **56** *SC* **Figure 56-3** *P* **91** *L* # **395**

Kramer, Glen — Teknovus

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

The layring diagram on Figure 56-3 does not match the baseline layering diagram (see http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/802/3/efm/baseline/haran-sala_p2mp_1_0702.pdf).

During additional discussion via conference calls the above model was further refined (see "P2MP layering diagram refinement" presentation).

SuggestedRemedy

Modify Figure 56-3 to match layering diagram of model #4 in the accompanying "P2MP layering diagram refinement" presentation.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **56** *SC* **Figure 56-5** *P* **95** *L* **14** # **174**

Bharati, Barnali — Wipro Technologies

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

In the 'PARSE' state, 3 transition conditions are specified.
1) Length_Type == MAC Control
2) (Length_Type == MAC Control) and (subtype in {GATE, REPORT, REGISTER, REGISTER_REQ, REGISTER_ACK})
3) else

This first condition 'Length_Type == MAC Control' is incomplete.

SuggestedRemedy

Instead of just 'Length_Type == MAC Control' It should be (Length_Type == MAC Control) and !(subtype in{GATE,REPORT,REGISTER,REGISTER_REQ, REGISTER_ACK})

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **56** *SC* **Figure 56-6** *P* **96** *L* # **658**

Diab, Wael William — Cisco Systems

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

Transmit exit condition to Send Data Frame could be clarified

SuggestedRemedy

Condition reads:
MA_DATA.requst and !MA_CONTROL.request and registered == true

Rewrite to:
!MA_CONTROL.request and MA_DATA.requst and registered == true

MA_CONTROL condition upfront makes it easier to read

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **56** *SC* **Figure 56-6** *P* **96** *L* **14** # **176**

Bharati, Barnali — Wipro Technologies

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

Variable 'TXAllowed' used in this state machine is not specified in the variables list 56.2.3.1.2.

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **56** *SC* **Figure 56-6** *P* **96** *L* **8** # **175**

Bharati, Barnali — Wipro Technologies

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

Condition to enter 'LASER ON' state from 'WAIT' sate is 'LaserControl == true or Master == true'.
Since 'LaserControl' and 'Master' is always true for the OLT, checking only if LaserControl == true is sufficient.

SuggestedRemedy

Instead of 'LaserControl == true or Master == true', it could be 'LaserControl == true' only.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **56** *SC* **Figure 56-8** *P* **100** *L* # **164**

Jin Kim — Samsung

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

In the middle of figure 56-8, there is 'PARSE INDICATION' block.
In this bolck, timestamp and subtype is defined as follow.
timestamp = m_sdu[0:3]
subtype = m_sdu[4]

According to Figure 56-18, timestamp is located below opcode.
Therefore, their orders in figure 56-8 should be changed.

SuggestedRemedy

subtype = m_sdu[0]
timestamp = m_sdu[1:4]

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **56** *SC* **Figure 56-8** *P* **100** *L* **11** # **177**

Bharati, Barnali — Wipro Technologies

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

In state 'OMP TIMEOUT', the condition 'if not (Master and me == broadcast_ID)' would force OLT to go to ERROR state in case only one ONU was present and this ONU has sent a REGISTER_ACK with destroy flag set. So no more messages would come from the ONU. This would result in timeout of omp_timer and OLT would transit to EROOR STATE. Not desirable (I presume, variable 'me' would have proper MAC address)

SuggestedRemedy

Could 'me == broadcast_ID' be removed from the condition?

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **56** *SC* **Figure56-10** *P* **101** *L* **50** # **192**

OGURA, Yasuo — NTT

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

There is an arrow which name is "Gate.request(grant)".

SuggestedRemedy

I think of that this arrow is "MA_Control.request(gate)" and the direction of arrow should be inverse.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **56** *SC* **Figure56-12** *P* **109** *L* **12** # **169**

Ikeda, Kiyoshi — Matsushita Communic

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

wrong : Backoff = max(max_deferal, Backoff+1)

SuggestedRemedy

correct : Backoff = min(max_deferal, Backoff+1)

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **56** *SC* **Figure56-15** *P* **113** *L* **9** # **149**

Ken, Murakami — Mitsubishi Electric

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

In the current specification, RTT calculation is performed only when the OLT receives the REGISTER_REQ message. The RTT calculation is also necessary in Report processing. The REPORT message is issued at the cycle of periodic_timer at least. The clock ppm difference between OLT and ONU is tuned using this cyclic REPORT messages.

SuggestedRemedy

The RTT calculation process is indicated in REGISTER state in Discovery processing. This process should be added as a process of OMP.indication event in Report processing.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **56** *SC* **Figure56-17** *P* **118** *L* **31** # **196**
OGURA, Yasuo NTT

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

Inside of the state:"PROGRAM", ther is a variable:"if request_report".

SuggestedRemedy

I think of that it should be a "if force_report".

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **56** *SC* **Figure56-17** *P* **118** *L* **8** # **195**
OGURA, Yasuo NTT

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

Inside of the state:"START_TX", there is a "GRANT.indication(start_grant, effective_length)".

SuggestedRemedy

I think of that it should be a "MA_CONTROL.indication(startt_grant)".

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **56** *SC* **Figure56-2** *P* **90** *L* **3** # **147**
Ken, Murakami Mitsubishi Electric

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

The operation of PAUSE function and the interaction of PAUSE with MPCP and OAM need more study. If the PAUSE function specified in Annex 31B is applied in P2MP without modification, some problems will be caused. For example, when pause is enabled to a certain ONU in the downstream, not only data frames but also control frames to this ONU cannot be sent. As a result, data frames from this ONU cannot be sent in the upstream since grants are not allocated during pause period. Therefore, some modifications to the current PAUSE function specified in Annex 31B are necessary. Though the concept of PAUSE can be left in the draft, the operation of PAUSE needs more study.

SuggestedRemedy

The following note should be added immedicately below Figure 56-2.
(note) The operation of PAUSE specified in Annex 31B needs more study.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **56** *SC* **Figure56-5** *P* **95** *L* **3** # **148**
Ken, Murakami Mitsubishi Electric

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

The branch condition to PAUSE is not enough. In addition to Length_Type, subtype should be considered.

SuggestedRemedy

The branch condition to PAUSE should be (Length_Type == MAC Control) and (subtype == PAUSE).

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **56** *SC* **Table 56-2** *P* **120** *L* **29** # **102**
Haran, Onn Passave

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

The definition of "Force Report" is not clear.

In the case when more than one grant exists inside GATE message, then it is uncertain to which of these grants "Force Report" relates.

SuggestedRemedy

Define "Force Report" as a vector with the size of 4 bits. Each bit will relate to a specific grant.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **56** *SC* **Table 56-6** *P* **128** *L* **5** # **79**
Turner, Ed Lattice Semiconductor

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

Typos.

SuggestedRemedy

Change 'Succes' to 'Success' and 'successfuly' to 'successfully'.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **57** *SC* **"Figure56-2"** *P* **141** *L* # **46**

Taro, Ishida NTT

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

"TS_EN=false",in "COMPLETE" sate of Figure 56-2,should be changed into "TX_EN=false".

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **57** *SC* **1** *P* **134** *L* **36** # **715**

Sala, Dolors Broadcom

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

The purpose of this clause is not to define the GMII. It would be better to describe this clause defining the particular functions added from clause 35.

SuggestedRemedy

The purpose of this clause is to extend clause 35 to support data transmission in the preamble. I think the list of characteristics in lines 40-50 in page 134 and section 57.1.1 should list the features added (from clause 35) and these are: 1) (f in page 135) the support of multiple PLS service interfaces and 2) trasnmission of LLID in the preamble 3) filtering of packets based on LLID with support of P2PE and SE ONU filtering

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **57** *SC* **2.2** *P* **140** *L* # **717**

Sala, Dolors Broadcom

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

I have two commetns on the state diagrams:

The none flag for the xxx_PLS variables require to reserve a value of the LLID. This value cannot be a valid value for LLID assignment. We should try to find a description that avoids this.

In figure 56-2 I do not have clear how it works. So I may comments may be on misinterpretation. I would like more explanation. But my current comments are.

The error state seems to trigger when Transmit_PLS != j but this is the initial case. So it seems it always gives error.

Also, the error tracking should result in abort of the current frame transmission and error indication to layer management and possibly to MAC to discard the rest of the frame. We need to discuss and evaluate this case.

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **57** *SC* **2.4** *P* **142** *L* # **718**

Sala, Dolors Broadcom

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

I think it would be useful to show the MAC data stream with a figure similar to 57-2 to describe the mapping.

The way is writen is difficult to interpret what "preamble" refers to. Actually it means different things in different places for example in figure 57-2 and line 20.

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **57** *SC* **52** *P* **136** *L* # **716**

Sala, Dolors — Broadcom

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

This clause should support a general filtering based on LLID and mode bit (see baseline sala_3_05_2.pdf page 10). The current description only supports P2PE filtering.

This is reflected in lines 12 41 in page 137, lines 10, 31 in page 138, line 38 in page 139, Figures 56-1, Fig 56-2

SuggestedRemedy

The "j" mapping (the filtering in particular) is a more complicated function. See the baseline page indicated.

I think this amount of duplication with clause 35 could be avoided if the single to multiple interfaces is described as a separate step. This would allow to highlight better the differences too.

One way to describe this is to keep all GMII-RS interface as is in clause 35
Hence subclause 57.2.1 would directly point to the corresponding subclause 35. And add an extra step to do the final mapping of a single PLS_CARRIER to multiple PLS_CARRIER[j] according to the function. This will also allow to reduce the figures 56-1 and 56-2 to focus on the mapping only.

Otherwise the mapping function needs to be added in all the lines where j is described and the figures updated.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **57** *SC* **57.1** *P* **134** *L* **36** # **80**

Turner, Ed — Lattice Semiconductor

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

Typo.

SuggestedRemedy

Change 'sublayer' to 'sublayers'.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **57** *SC* **57.1.2** *P* **135** *L* **26** # **81**

Turner, Ed — Lattice Semiconductor

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

Unneccessary 'over'.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete 'over'.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **57** *SC* **57.1.3** *P* *L* **26** # **9**

Marris, Arthur — Cadence Design Syste

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

Delete the word "over"

SuggestedRemedy

Delete the word "over"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **57** *SC* **57.1.3** *P* **135** *L* **32** # **82**

Turner, Ed — Lattice Semiconductor

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

The last sentence of this paragraph is a repetition of the information in the first sentence of the paragraph and is unneccessary.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete the last sentence: 'Reconciliation .. .. other interfaces.'

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **57** *SC* **57.2.4.2.1** *P* **142** *L* **20** # **83**

Turner, Ed — Lattice Semiconductor

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

Missing a space between '8' and 'octets'.

SuggestedRemedy

Insert a space.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **57** *SC* **57.2.4.2.1** *P* **figure 56-1** *L* # **161**

Jaeyeon Song — Samsung Electronics

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

In table 56-1 "preamble definition" tell us the 2 bytes of preamble is allocated to LLID.
In baseline we agreed the LLID consist of a mode- bit and PHY_ID fields. The mode-bit represents the two mode, broadcast and unicast, not multicast.
In EPON, no protocol of supporting multicast traffic exists. But, multicast traffic will be in the EPON, and we should distinguish multicast traffic from broadcast.

SuggestedRemedy

We should define multicast LLID. In addition, multicast LLID don't have to be allocated through the auto-discovery process. It remains in high layer protocol. we just define the hook of supporting multicast traffic.
The possible solution is : Using the multicast address in MAC, we can make the multicast LLID by hash function or direct mapping. It is simple, no burden to MAC, and RS layer filtering is possible like other LLIDs.
I will prepare presentation about it.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **57** *SC* **57.2.4.2.1** *P* **figure 56-1** *L* # **162**

Jaeyeon Song — Samsung Electronics

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

In table 56-1 "preamble definition" tell us the 2 bytes of preamble is allocated to LLID.
In baseline we agreed the LLID consist of a mode- bit and PHY_ID fields. The mode-bit represents the two mode, broadcast and unicast, not multicast.
In EPON, no protocol of supporting multicast traffic exists. But, multicast traffic will be in the EPON, and we should distinguish multicast traffic from broadcast.

SuggestedRemedy

We should define multicast LLID. In addition, multicast LLID don't have to be allocated through the auto-discovery process. It remains in high layer protocol. we just define the hook of supporting multicast traffic.

The possible solution is : Using the multicast address in MAC, we can make the multicast LLID by hash function or direct mapping. It is simple, no burden to MAC and RS layer filtering is possible like other LLIDs.

I will prepare presentation about it.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **57** *SC* **57.2.4.2.2** *P* **143** *L* **5** # **84**

Turner, Ed — Lattice Semiconductor

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

Typo in '..reception th epreamble..'

SuggestedRemedy

Change to '..reception the preamble..'

Proposed Response *Response Status* **O**

Cl **58** *SC* *P* **151** *L* **1** # **387**

Bhatt, Vipul — (Not Applicable)

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D** *Name*

Title is too long and not strictly correct. Each PMD sublayer and baseband medium is one package, not a separate item for each direction.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace the title with a new title:
"Physical Medium Dependent (PMD) sublayer and baseband medium, type 1000BASE-PX (PON)".

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **58** *SC* *P* **151** *L* **11** # **384**

Bhatt, Vipul — (Not Applicable)

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

Please refer to Editor's Note: "Clause 58.7 on page 168 and Clause 58.8 on page 169, (worst case power budget and link penalty tables) will be removed prior to publication."

I think it will be wise to keep those tables. They act as a quick reference, an executive summary of a link's design. For those trying to understand PMD specification tables, the link budget tables provide a quick application example, which helps promote understanding. If there is any discrepancy between link model spreadsheet and these tables, we can either remove the discrepancy or use suitable words to highlight how to resolve it. Overall, the benefit of keeping those informative tables is more than the cost.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete the note.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Commentor will present information at the upcoming meeting.

Cl **58** *SC* **16** *P* **178** *L* **10, 11, an** # **436**

John George OFS

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

Fiber Optical cable requirements do not reflect Optics PMD task force instructions to editor to in July:
"Adopt Table and Fiber types mentioned in dot ae 52.14.1 and Table 52-25, but change wavelength to 1490 nm => Specify attenuation at 1490nm (fiber manufacturers), but would still work at 1550 nm, so keep 1550nm and add a column for 1490nm
*Final Proposal: Start with Table 53-14, add 1490-1550 column when made available by Fiber manufacturers (19 6 3) voting (for against abstain) pass"

SuggestedRemedy

Replace lines 10 and 11 with text in clause 60.15, page 224 line 37 through 42, and change reference in said text from Figure 60-2 to Figure 58-1. Replace table 58-24 with table 59-19, modified to remove the columns labelled "50 um MMF" and "62.5 MMF"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT. This comment is unclear, do not see the difference between the document with the proposed changes to the table. The information with the voting did not reach the editor. Need calification

Cl **58** *SC* **17** *P* **180** *L* **15** # **437**

John George OFS

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

Redundant with 58.16

SuggestedRemedy

Delete line 13 through 15

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Will verify and fix if appropriate

Cl **58** *SC* **58** *P* **151** *L* # **323**

Dawe, Piers Agilent

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

Note several comments against clause 60, about how to specify fiber, nomenclature, and such, which may apply to the other optics clauses.

SuggestedRemedy

per comment

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Will discuss with comments on C60

Cl **58** *SC* **58** *P* **151** *L* # **335**

Dawe, Piers Agilent

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

The timing parameters cannot be decided in isolation. We need to take the PMA and PCS into account, as well as upper layers. There is no point in flogging the electronics for high "efficiency" in bits delivered per nominal bit: a PON is a distributed switching system with severe latency challenges and like any such switching fabric would be expected to carry a substantial bandwidth overhead. Cost-efficiency, in bits delivered per dollar, is far more relevant.

SuggestedRemedy

Create a timing analysis which spans the full layer stack, "logic", "electronics" and "optics" before choosing timing parameters. Consider being flexible with the head end receiver timing parameters; after all, it controls the timing of the bursts it receives, so can take account its own capabilities.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Needs technical presentations, PMA and PCS discussions are conducted in other groups

Cl **58** *SC* **58** *P* **156** *L* # **272**

Dawe, Piers Agilent

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

Our fibre experts tell us that the nomenclature "10 um" SMF is deprecated, as nothing is necessarily 10 um. Anyway it's unnecessary.

SuggestedRemedy

Search and eliminate all "10 um". Occasionally you may need to say "Type B1.1, B1.3 SMF", but in nearly all cases, just "SMF" will do fine.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **58** *SC* **58** *P* **187** *L* # **278**

Dawe, Piers Agilent

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

"Transmitter type Longwave Laser": Use of lasers, or a particular type, is an implementation choice, not a requirement of the standard. Later in a receiver table it is even less appropriate.

SuggestedRemedy

Search and eliminate the lines "Transmitter type Longwave Laser": in at least eight tables.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. This discussion should be made in conjunction with presentation diab_optics_1_0902

Cl **58** *SC* **58.1** *P* **152** *L* **6** # **584**

Nguyen, Trung National Semiconduct

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

Reference to 1000BASE-X PCS refers to wrong Clause.

SuggestedRemedy

Change from Clause 57 to Clause 36

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT. Will be fixed on the next revision

Cl **58** *SC* **58.11.12** *P* **173** *L* # **65**

Khermosh, Lior Passave

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

Add testing to PON timing specifications - measuring ONU trasnmitter laser on and off. Measuring OLT receiver locking time.

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Laser on times are a PMD issue and require considerable discussion. Receiver locking times also need discussion, perhaps in P2MP adhoc? See comment 60. Testing section will be added in future revisions of the draft in conjunction with the work of the PON adhoc

Cl **58** *SC* **58.15.2** *P* **177** *L* **25** # **587**

Nguyen, Trung National Semiconduct

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

Wrong Type mentioned

SuggestedRemedy

Change to Type B

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT. Will be fixed on the next revision

Cl **58** *SC* **58.16** *P* **178** *L* # **66**

Khermosh, Lior Passave

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

Is it necessary to add specifications for Fiber round trip delay?
Is it necessary to add specification for variation of n with temperature?

SuggestedRemedy

Define parameters for abselute RTT (max) for the link, variations due to temperature.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT. RTT will be included in P2MP discussions. If an upper limit needs to be fixed, this can be related back to the PMD group for specification

Cl **58** *SC* **58.2.4** *P* **184** *L* **7** # **333**

Dawe, Piers Agilent

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

Signal detect: it's universal at present in continuous-mode receivers (point to point) but the everyday signal detect approach in clause 38 won't be fast enough to detect individual bursts in a head end burst mode receiver. Further, if EFM is to aspire to a first mile in a consumer market, every pin and mW needs to be scrutinised and possibly jettisoned, especially in the continuous-mode CPE receiver. See GR-253 for how PMD signal detect need not be mandatory. The standard does not have enough reason for demanding that the function be implemented in the PMD (although implementers may choose to use it), nor that the signal detect status be reported in duplicate, though a physical pin and through a management interface. Signal detect is not the primary way of detecting breaking links; these are detected by noting a "run of zeroes" (coding violation). However, an optional signal detect may be useful in near-term mid-price equipment and even for confirming cabling failures between the head end and the splitter in a PON. In the suggested remedy I have assumed that 1000BASE-PX will use Clause 45 MDIO.
Also it's nice if signal detect operates below sensitivity.
I wonder if clause 36 is compatible with PON operation. If the bursts cause SD chatter, will this foul up the PCS?

SuggestedRemedy

Check that 36 as modified is compatible with the following. I think the state machine Figure 36–9 and 36.2.5.1.4 (signal_detectCHANGE) will work with (a conceptual, non-existent, cheap) SD hard wired to OK.
Check that clause 36 is compatible with PON operation. If the bursts cause SD chatter, will this foul up the PCS?
Suggested text for 59.2.4:
The signal detect function is traditionally implemented in the transceiver, although it may be implemented elsewhere, e.g. in association with the PMA, or not implemented. If implemented within the PMD, the PMD Signal Detect status shall be reported either or both of two ways. The PMD Signal Detect function may report to the PMD service interface, using the message PMD_SIGNAL.indicate(SIGNAL_DETECT) which is signaled continuously.
PMD_SIGNAL.indicate is intended to be an indicator of optical signal presence. Or the status may be reported via the management interface. If the MDIO interface is implemented, the value of SIGNAL_DETECT may contribute to the latching link status register bit 1.2 described in 22.2.4.2.13.

If implemented, the value of the SIGNAL_DETECT parameter shall be generated according to the conditions defined in Table 60-1. If signal detect is not implemented, the value of the SIGNAL_DETECT parameter conveyed to the upper layers and management functions shall be "OK". The PMD receiver is not required to verify whether a compliant signal is being received. This standard imposes no response time requirements on the generation of the SIGNAL_DETECT parameter. It is preferable for the signal detect thresholds to be below the rated sensitivity of the receiver; they must be below the Receiver sensitivity (max) in this standard.

As an unavoidable consequence of the requirements for the setting of the SIGNAL_DETECT parameter, implementations must provide adequate margin between the input optical power level at which the SIGNAL_DETECT parameter is set to OK, and the inherent noise level of the PMD due to cross talk, power supply noise, etc.

Various implementations of the Signal Detect function are permitted by this standard, including implementations that generate the SIGNAL_DETECT parameter values in response to the amplitude of the modulation of the optical signal and implementations that respond to the average optical power of the modulated optical signal. Full Ethernet implementations which do not use a PMD signal detect, or which do not use any signal detect, must avoid noise, chatter or crosstalk creating a bogus signal with the characteristics of a real signal, which is not otherwise identified as bogus.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. See comment 58.

Cl **58** *SC* **58.2.4.1.1 & 58.2.4.2.1** *P* **154155** *L* # **58**

Khermosh, Lior Passave

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **D** *PON SD*

SD timing required:
Is SD state at the OLT changing between ONUs - What is the level of SD during guard band?

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. SD strategies for burst-mode operation need to be discussed. This could take the form of a request from the P2MP group to the optics PMD group

Cl **58** *SC* **58.3** *P* *L* # **527**

McCammon, Kent SBC Technology Reso

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

Specification of the laser transmitter tolerance to reflection from the fiber network.

SuggestedRemedy

Add a specification for tolerance to reflections to each transmitter, Type A and Type B for OLT and ONU. Existing PON standards ITU_T G.983.1 contain values for tolerance to transmitter incident light power of -15 dB such that high level of reflections are tolerated without penalty.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. This change would require technical presentations

Cl **58** *SC* **58.3.1, 58.5.1,** *P* **157, 163.** *L* **in tables.** # **56**

Frank Effenberger Quantum Bridge Com

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

The downstream laser line widths of 1 nm RMS are too large. Also, the use of RMS specification for single longitudinal mode lasers is inappropriate.

SuggestedRemedy

The downstream laser line widths should be defined by their 20 dB width, and that width should be 1 nm. A footnote should be added to state: "The line width of the SLM laser is expected to be less than 1 nm."

The specific changes are:
Page 157: Change 'RMS spectral width' to 'Spectral width at -20dB points'
Page 157: Add note to changed text "The line width of the SLM laser is expected to be less than 1 nm."

Page 163: Change 'RMS spectral width' to 'Spectral width at -20dB points'
Page 163: Add note to changed text "The line width of the SLM laser is expected to be less than 1 nm."

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. It is accepted that the value for the laser linewidth needs investigation. The method of definition is consistent with existing standards

Cl **58** *SC* **58.3.2** *P* **158** *L* **4** # **732**

Dawe, Piers Agilent

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

The sentence "The sampling instant is defined to occur at the eye center." could be applied to the testing of an individual untimed optical transceiver but since clause 38 was written we have moved towards specifying the whole system: a "black box" with ports and interfaces. We can specify what we like but the equipment will sample where it likes, and if its choice affects sensitivity, that's part of what we are assuring. Compare clauses 52 and 53.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete this sentence, here and in 58.4.2, 58.5.2 and 58.6.2.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. This requires further discussion of testing issues

Cl **58** *SC* **58.3.2, 58.4.1, 58.5.2, 5** *P* **158, 160, 16** *L* **in tables.** # **57**

Frank Effenberger Quantum Bridge Com

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

The burst mode timing targets are indeed practical. The editor's notes should be removed, and the values made normative.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the editor's notes regarding the burst mode timing values.

The specific changes are:
1000Base-PX-OLT-A T_Optical_recovery_time notes removed(page 158)
1000Base-PX-ONU-A T_On and T-Off notes removed(page 160)

1000Base-PX-OLT-B T_Optical_recovery_time notes removed(page 164)
1000Base-PX-ONU-B T_On and T-Off notes removed(page 166)

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. More work is still to be done on this topic and the total budget available for recovery to be discussed with the PMA group

Cl **58** *SC* **58.3.2, 58.4.1, 58.5.2, 5** *P* **158, 160, 16** *L* **in tables.** # **54**

Frank Effenberger Quantum Bridge Com

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

The upstream power budgets place too heavy a burden on the OLT receiver sensitivity. As they stand, it will be very difficult to construct type B OLT receivers.

SuggestedRemedy

The upstream power levels should be increased by 1 dB overall.

The specific changes are:
1000Base-PX-ONT-A maximum receive power changed to -2 dBm (page 158)
1000Base-PX-ONT-A receive sensitivity changed to -25 dBm (page 158)
1000Base-PX-ONU-A average launch power (min) to -2 dBm (page 160)
1000Base-PX-ONU-A average launch power (max) to +3 dBm (page 160)

1000Base-PX-ONT-B maximum receive power changed to -7 dBm (page 164)
1000Base-PX-ONT-B receive sensitivity changed to -28 dBm (page 164)
1000Base-PX-ONU-B average launch power (min) to -2 dBm (page 166)
1000Base-PX-ONU-B average launch power (max) to +3 dBm (page 166)

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. The power budget could be changed subject to the consensus of the group and a more detailed technical presentation on the issue; perhaps as part of the PON ad-hoc group

Cl **58** *SC* **58.3-6** *P* **157167** *L* # **736**

Dawe, Piers — Agilent

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

The stringent fast Tx risetime and limited Rx bandwidth requirements in clause 38 are to protect against the effects of ringy Tx signals exacerbated by modal dispersion in MMF. 1000BASE-PX doesn't use MMF so these specs can be relaxed significantly. I'll try to run the numbers before the meeting, but probably the risetime implied by the mask is sufficient.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete rise/fall time spec in four tables. Consider a relaxed Receive electrical 3 dB upper cutoff frequency spec in four tables.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Needs technical presentations

Cl **58** *SC* **58.3-6** *P* **15767** *L* # **334**

Dawe, Piers — Agilent

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

Four reasons why the minimum extinction ratio should be lowered:
the present high value is a burden to meet over a wider temperature range,
it is contrary to the requirements of high speed and low dispersion penalty,
a burst mode transmitter has more important design challenges so we should relax this one, and,
in a "system level" specification, at least on the continuous mode head end it should be measurable in "mission mode" (remote fault indication? idle? polling for outstations?) rather than the K28.7 data pattern (125 MHz square wave), so the apparent reading will be lower.

SuggestedRemedy

6 dB (all four times)

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Needs a technical presentation of why 6dB is appropriate for all 4.

Cl **58** *SC* **58.4** *P* **159** *L* **6** # **585**

Nguyen, Trung — National Semiconduct

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

Example of meeting minimum range should be for a Type A transceiver, not a Type B transceiver.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to "e.g. a single-mode solution operating at 10500m meets a minimum range requirement of 2 to 10000m for Type A."

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT. Will be fixed on the next revision

Cl **58** *SC* **58.4 & 58.6** *P* **159165** *L* # **59**

Khermosh, Lior — Passave

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

What is the line controlling the laser switching? How is it imported from higher layers (MPCP)?

SuggestedRemedy

Use TX_disable/enable line or maybe special 10 bit word

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. PMD_signal.request primitive. Need to copy the comment to Cl.54

Cl **58** *SC* **58.4.1** *P* **160** *L* **20** # **340**

Dawe, Piers — Agilent

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

Spectral specification in table 58-10 is at present not quite adequate to guard against mode partition noise and may be too tight for minimum cost over a very extended temperature range.

SuggestedRemedy

See my comment against clause 59 to use a combination of maxima of |epsilon_max| where epsilon = Dispersion.length.spectral width.Baud with TDP assurance.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Need a technical presentation and decision before this may be changed

---

Cl **58** *SC* **58.5.1** *P* **163** *L* **3** # **586**

Nguyen, Trung — National Semiconduct

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

Wrong Type mentioned

SuggestedRemedy

Change to Type B or remove

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT. Will be fixed on the next revision

Cl **58** *SC* **58.9, 58.10** *P* **170171** *L* # **62**

Khermosh, Lior Passave

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

Is the system assumed to be synchronous or pleosynchronous (or both?).
Jitter and reciever timing specifications would be different for each case.

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT. The system decision is the work of another group, then the jitter values may be addressed. No specific suggested remedy.

Cl **58** *SC* **58.9, 58.10** *P* **170171** *L* **3** # **61**

Khermosh, Lior Passave

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

Although the jitter specifications are not yet specified:
Does the 637KHz high frequency jitter imply on the CDR loop BW. In that case it may be inconsistent with the fast locking specified in the former sub-sections.

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT. No remedy proposed. As of yet, no discussion of CDR issues

Cl **58** *SC* **Table 58-1** *P* **152** *L* **31** # **85**

Turner, Ed Lattice Semiconductor

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

The four instances of '1000Base..' in this table are not capitalized.

SuggestedRemedy

Capitalize the four instances of '1000Base..' to '1000BASE..'.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT. Will be fixed on the next revision

Cl **58** *SC* **Table 58-10,58-16** *P* **160166** *L* **3538** # **63**

Khermosh, Lior Passave

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

Does T-on include the time required for the fault detector loop to stabelize or can this loop work in longer cycles.

Clarification: Is Ton similar in ONU type A (FP) and ONU type B (DFB)?

SuggestedRemedy

Increase Ton to include all parameters

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT. Need clarification of this comment. The time specified refers to a PMD on time, not a laser type

Cl **58** *SC* **Table 58-6** *P* **156** *L* **26** # **287**

Dawe, Piers Agilent

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

"Minimum range (meters), x to 10000" will attract the style police.

SuggestedRemedy

Minimum range
(x or 0.5 m) to 10 km (in four tables)

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Need further discussion

Cl **58** *SC* **Table 58-6** *P* **156** *L* **26** # **288**

Dawe, Piers Agilent

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D** *MinRange*

Need a value for x. 100MB/s has chosen 0.5 m.

SuggestedRemedy

0.5 m

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Need further discussion

Cl **58** *SC* **Table 58-8, 58-14** *P* **158164** *L* **1819** # **64**

Khermosh, Lior Passave

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

Average receive power (max) at OLT type A is -3dbm and at OLT type B is -8dbm.
This may cause problems when designing a PON system since we might have difficulties in combining for the same OLT near and far ONUs together.

SuggestedRemedy

Need to choose one number for both.
If numbers remain the same need to change the testing spec at section 58.11 for type B.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Need clarification as to the reasoning behind the values in the tables

---

Cl **58** *SC* **Table 58-8, 58-14** *P* **158164** *L* **3334** # **60**

Khermosh, Lior Passave

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

What are the optical link and data conditions assumed for this timing specifications?
Is there any specific sequence on line assumed?
Is synchronization assumed to be starting from noise level or from another existing optical signal level (laser on time and laser off of the former ONU ovelapping)?
As ONUs may overlap in on and off time what is the SNR to start counting the locking time?

SuggestedRemedy

Increase timing to accomadate any data sequence on line and synchronization from worse case conditions.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT. All timing issues subject to P2MP issues. Need further study and work between the groups.

Cl **58** *SC* **Table58-2** *P* **152** *L* # **47**

Shino, Koji NTT

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D** *SDsign*

"Input_optical_power <= Receive sensitivity" shuld be changed into "Input_optical_power >= Receive sensitivity"

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **58** *SC* **Table58-3** *P* **155** *L* # **48**

Shino, Koji NTT

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D** *SDsign*

"Input_optical_power <= Receive sensitivity" shuld be changed into "Input_optical_power >= Receive sensitivity"

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT. Will verify and fix if appropriate

Cl **58** *SC* **Table58-4** *P* **155** *L* # **49**

Shino, Koji NTT

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D** *SDsign*

"Input_optical_power <= Receive sensitivity" shuld be changed into "Input_optical_power >= Receive sensitivity"

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT. Will verify and fix if appropriate

Cl **58** *SC* **Table58-5** *P* **156** *L* # **50**

Shino, Koji NTT

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D** *SDsign*

"Input_optical_power <= Receive sensitivity" shuld be changed into "Input_optical_power >= Receive sensitivity"

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT. Will verify and fix if appropriate

Cl **58** *SC* **Table58-7,Table58-10,T** *P* **1571601631** *L* **20** # **173**

KAKUNO, YUTAKA Sumitomo Electric Ind

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

RMS spectral width is the expression of the characteristics of the multi longitudinal mode laser. For single mode longitudinal laser -20dB spectral width and side mode suppression ratio are usually used instead of RMS width.
Considering the values of this parameter in the tables, only ONU Type A can adopt multi longitudinal mode laser.
And the other three type of transmitters uses single longitudinal mode laser.

To make the specifications clear, the definition for spectral width should be separated by the two types of lasers.

SuggestedRemedy

Please see the attatched table file.
The file name is Spectralwidth.pdf (aka kakuno_c1_0902.pdf).

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. See comment 56

Cl **59** *SC* *P* *L* # **528**

McCammon, Kent SBC Technology Reso

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D** *Name*

The use of the term OLT and ONU for 1000Base-BX P2P PMD is easily confused with the use of OLT and ONU for P2MP systems

SuggestedRemedy

Consider using a different term for central office and remote P2P stations in the document that is different than P2MP.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Presentation (diab_optics_1_0902) will be made on naming, with new conventions to be adopted at New Orleans meeting.

Cl **59** *SC* *P* **181** *L* **1** # **388**

Bhatt, Vipul (Not Applicable)

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D** *Name*

Title is too long and not strictly correct. Each PMD sublayer and baseband medium is one package, not a separate item for each direction. Also, the use of the word "laser" is unnecessary and assumes a certain implementation. And the word "extended" can be confusingly interpreted as "distance-extended".

SuggestedRemedy

Replace the title with a new title:
"Physical Medium Dependent (PMD) sublayer and baseband medium, type 1000BASE-EX (Temperature-Extended Longwave) and 1000BASE-BX (BiDirectional Long Wavelength)".

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. See comment 528

Cl **59** *SC* *P* **181** *L* **8** # **385**

Bhatt, Vipul (Not Applicable)

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

Please refer to Editor's Note: "Keep Clauses 59.6 and 59.7 (worst case power budget and link penalty tables) for now, remove them prior ro final publication."

I think it will be wise to keep those tables. They act as a quick reference, an executive summary of a link's design. For those trying to understand PMD specification tables, the link budget tables provide a quick application example, which helps promote understanding. If there is any discrepancy between link model spreadsheet and these tables, we can either remove the discrepancy or use suitable words to highlight how to resolve it. Overall, the benefit of keeping those informative tables is more than the cost.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete the note.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. There is valid concern for further group discussion

Cl **59** *SC* **15** *P* **205** *L* **10 and 11** # **438**

John George OFS

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

Align text with that of clause 60 to clarify requirements.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace with 60.15.1 page 224 lines 46 through 48. Keep reference as table 59-19.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Tables 58-24, 59-19 and 60-20 need reconciliation.

Cl **59** *SC* **15** *P* **205** *L* **51** # **439**

John George OFS

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

Redundant

SuggestedRemedy

Delete lines 51 through 53

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **59** *SC* **59** *P* **181** *L* # **324**

Dawe, Piers Agilent

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

Note several comments against clause 60, about how to specify fiber, nomenclature, and such, which may apply to the other optics clauses.

SuggestedRemedy

per comment

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. See resolution to clause 60 comments, make consistent with Clause 60.

Cl **59** *SC* **59** *P* **181** *L* **1** # **330**

Dawe, Piers Agilent

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D** *Name*

Is "1000BASE-EX" a smart choice of name? Compare 10 gigabit's easy-to understand S (short wavelength), L (long wavelength), E (extra long wavelength). This PMD isn't extra long wavelength, or long reach by today's standards, it is really an upgrading of the long wavelength 1000BASE-LX. We should keep "1000BASE-EX" for any future 1550 nm gigabit Ethernet PMD standardisation. I suggest "1000BASE-MX" because M is next after L.

SuggestedRemedy

1000BASE-MX

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. See comment 528

Cl **59** *SC* **59** *P* **186** *L* # **273**

Dawe, Piers Agilent

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

Our fibre experts tell us that the nomenclature "10 um" SMF is deprecated, as nothing is necessarily 10 um. Anyway it's unnecessary.

SuggestedRemedy

Search and eliminate all "10 um". Occasionally you may need to say "Type B1.1, B1.3 SMF", but in nearly all cases, just "SMF" will do fine.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **59** *SC* **59** *P* **187** *L* # **277**

Dawe, Piers Agilent

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

"Transmitter type Longwave Laser": Use of lasers, or a particular type, is an implementation choice, not a requirement of the standard. Later in a receiver table it is even less appropriate.

SuggestedRemedy

Search and eliminate the lines "Transmitter type Longwave Laser": in at least six tables.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Need further discussion

Cl **59** *SC* **59.1** *P* **182** *L* # **556**

Richard Brand Nortel Networks

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

Much text needed

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT. Draft in progress. No remedy suggested.

Cl **59** *SC* **59.1.1** *P* **182** *L* # **602**

Tatum, Jim Honeywell

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D** *Name*

59.1.1 Goals and objectives should be removed
59.1.2 should be removed
59.1.3 should be removed

SuggestedRemedy

I believe this clause should mirror clause 38 as much as possible

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. This may be a decision about document style and structure, and issues like consistency with the remaining clauses should play a key role in deciding our reponse here.

Cl **59** *SC* **59.1.1** *P* **182** *L* **18** # **588**

Nguyen, Trung — National Semiconduct

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D** *Name*

Name of transceiver type is wrong

SuggestedRemedy

Change to 1000BASE-EX and 1000BASE-BX

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Will be changed to match new naming convention per comment 528

Cl **59** *SC* **59.1.4** *P* **182** *L* # **603**

Tatum, Jim — Honeywell

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

59.1.4 should be edited to match clause 38

SuggestedRemedy

Use Clause 38.1.1 as the basis for the PMD service interface

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT. include text from 38.1.1 modified as follows: The following specifies the services provided by the 1000BASE-EX and 1000BASE-BX PMD. These PMD sublayers are described in an abstract manner and do not imply any particular implementation. The PMD Service Interface supports the exchange of encoded 8B/10B characters between PMA entities.The PMD translates the encoded 8B/10B characters to and from signals suitable for the specified medium.The following primitives are defined:PMD_UNITDATA.request
PMD_UNITDATA.indicate
PMD_SIGNAL.indicate
NOTE Delay requirements from the MDI to GMII which include the PMD layer are specified in clause 36. Of this budget, 4 ns is reserved for each of the transmit and receive functions of the PMD.

Cl **59** *SC* **59.10** *P* **199** *L* # **627**

Tatum, Jim — Honeywell

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

Text and descriptions needed for test methodology

SuggestedRemedy

Use 38.6.5 as the basis for 59.10.7
Use 38.6.6 as the basis for 59.10.8
Use 38.6.7 as the basis for 59.10.9
Use 38.6.8 as the basis for 59.10.10
Use 38.6.9 as the basis for 59.10.11
Use 38.6.10 as the basis for 59.101.12 (If MMF used)
Use 38.6.11 as the basis for 59.10.13
Include reciever upper 3dB bandwidth limits using 38.6.12 as basis for new clause 59.10.14

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **59** *SC* **59.10 & .11 & .12** *P* **199** *L* # **573**

Richard Brand — Nortel Networks

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

Text needed

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT. No suggested remedy.

Cl **59** *SC* **59.10.2** *P* **199** *L* **13** # **571**

Richard Brand — Nortel Networks

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

Is '86 the latest revision?

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT. The draft should reference the latest specification.However, the commentor should provide a specific comment and remedy.

Cl **59** *SC* **59.10.3** *P* **199** *L* **18** # **328**

Dawe, Piers — Agilent

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

The pattern for extinction ratio conformance could be:
1. a special pattern for extinction ratio conformance (as 100BASE-LX, but not readily available to the end user so a poor choice for a system level spec),
2. the test pattern used for e.g. eye margin and sensitivity testing (the short continuous random test pattern defined in 36A.5: convenient to combine with eye margin measurement but not conveniently accessible in service), or
3. the pattern a station naturally emits when not receiving an optical input (accessible in service).
My choice is for (3). What is that pattern? is it idles with a low concentration of OAM frames? or is it far end fault indication, with or without the OAM frames? Or is it some auto-negotiation signal? What exactly is the (majority) bit stream on the line? With the 8B/10B code it may not matter much.

SuggestedRemedy

Find out what a 1000BASE-LX/EX optical port (will) emit(s) when no optical input. Use that for extinction ratio tests (and for mean power, if we have to be specific).

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. There is merit in making the change, but a STF discussion is warranted.

Cl **59** *SC* **59.10.4** *P* **199** *L* # **626**

Tatum, Jim — Honeywell

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

Decide on using OMA or extinction ratio

SuggestedRemedy

recommned using ER, which is what the system companies want to be specified.

Add or remove text to 59.10.5 as appropriate from resolution. Use Clause 52 as baseline for OMA deescription if kept.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. The decision of OMA/ER needs a comprehensive review. The commenter is encouraged to bring a recommendation and a motion for consideration by the sub task force.

Cl **59** *SC* **59.10.4 & .5** *P* **199** *L* # **572**

Richard Brand — Nortel Networks

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

Text needed

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT. No suggested remedy.

Cl **59** *SC* **59.11** *P* **201** *L* # **575**

Richard Brand — Nortel Networks

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

Text needed

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT. A suggested remedy is needed.

Cl **59** *SC* **59.11** *P* **201** *L* # **628**

Tatum, Jim — Honeywell

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

"text text text" not needed

59.11.1 not complete

SuggestedRemedy

Remove "text text text"
add IEC 600950:1991 to 59.11.1

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Use correct document number.

Cl **59** *SC* **59.11.2** *P* **201** *L* **11** # **332**

Dawe, Piers — Agilent

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

not all 1000BASE-X are subject to this clause, class 1 is now to IEC 60825-1.

SuggestedRemedy

See text of Clause 52, and 60.11.2 and comments thereto.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **59** *SC* **59.11.2** *P* **201** *L* **15** # **576**

Richard Brand — Nortel Networks

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

spelling

SuggestedRemedy

should read: "geographical regions."

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **59** *SC* **59.13** *P* **200** *L* # **574**
Richard Brand Nortel Networks

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **D**
Text needed

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED REJECT. Need a suggested remedy,

Cl **59** *SC* **59.14.1** *P* **204** *L* **17** # **577**
Richard Brand Nortel Networks

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **D**
Channel insertion loss values missing

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED REJECT. No suggested remedy

Cl **59** *SC* **59.14.2** *P* *L* # **630**
Tatum, Jim Honeywell

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**
Table incomplete

SuggestedRemedy
Generate numbers at meeting

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. The tables are a consequence of choosing specifications, so once a group review concludes that the specifications are complete, an informative link budget can be derived.

Cl **59** *SC* **59.14.2** *P* **204** *L* **34 & 39** # **578**
Richard Brand Nortel Networks

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **D**
Channel insertion loss values missing

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED REJECT. No suggested remedy

Cl **59** *SC* **59.15.2** *P* *L* # **631**
Tatum, Jim Honeywell

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **D**
Incomplete text

SuggestedRemedy
Use 38.11.2 as the basis for the cluase.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Suggest use of the term discrete reflectance to remove vagueness associated with the term return loss for splices and connectors.

Cl **59** *SC* **59.15.2.1 & .3** *P* **205** *L* # **579**
Richard Brand Nortel Networks

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **D**
Text needed

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED REJECT. No suggested remedy.

Cl **59** *SC* **59.15.3** *P* **206** *L* **10** # **580**
Richard Brand Nortel Networks

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**
Is "remateable" a word?

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED REJECT. Yes

Cl **59** *SC* **59.16** *P* **207** *L* # **632**
Tatum, Jim Honeywell

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**
PICS incomplete.

SuggestedRemedy
Use text in clause 38.12 as the basis for inclusion in 59

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

Cl **59** *SC* **59.16.2 & .3 & .4** *P* **207** *L* # **581**
Richard Brand Nortel Networks

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **D**
Text needed

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED REJECT. No suggested remedy.

Cl **59** *SC* **59.16.4.5 & .6 & .7** *P* **208** *L* # **582**
Richard Brand Nortel Networks

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **D**
Text needed

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED REJECT. No suggested remedy.

Cl **59** *SC* **59.2** *P* *L* # **604**
Tatum, Jim Honeywell

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**
Do not capitalize Transmit and Receive in line 2

SuggestedRemedy
Remove caps

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Will be fixed in next revision if appropriate. (It's not clear if these are proper names, serving as labels assigned to functions, or if they are the words"transmit" and "receive" in the generic sense.)

Cl **59** *SC* **59.2.1** *P* **183** *L* **10** # **605**
Tatum, Jim Honeywell

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **D** *MinRange*
x and y are not real numbers

SuggestedRemedy
replace with x=0.5 and y=2

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Actual value to be agreed on by the STF.

Cl **59** *SC* **59.2.1** *P* **183** *L* **13** # **606**
Tatum, Jim Honeywell

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**
xx.yy is undefined

SuggestedRemedy
replace with 59.10

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

Cl **59** *SC* **59.2.1** *P* **183** *L* **13** # **607**
Tatum, Jim Honeywell

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**
Reference to offset patchchord

SuggestedRemedy
Remove if SMF only

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED REJECT. The use of the word "if" in line 10 makes this comment unnecessary.

Cl **59** *SC* **59.2.1** *P* **183** *L* **13** # **557**
Richard Brand Nortel Networks

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **D**
Tests xx.yy needs definition

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT. Change xx.yy to 59.10

Cl **59** *SC* **59.2.4** *P* **184** *L* **7** # **331**

Dawe, Piers Agilent

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

Signal detect: it's universal at present but if EFM is to aspire to a first mile in a consumer market, every pin and mW needs to be scrutinised and possibly jettisoned. See GR-253 for how PMD signal detect need not be mandatory. The standard does not have enough reason for demanding that the function be implemented in the PMD (although implementers may choose to insist on it), nor that the signal detect status be reported in duplicate, though a physical pin and through a management interface. Signal detect is not the primary way of detecting breaking links; these are detected by noting a "run of zeroes" (coding violation).
Also it's nice if signal detect operates below sensitivity.

SuggestedRemedy

Check that 36 as modified is compatible with the following. I think the state machine Figure 36–9 and 36.2.5.1.4 (signal_detectCHANGE) will work with (a conceptual, non-existent, cheap) SD hard wired to OK.
Suggested text for 59.2.4:
The signal detect function is traditionally implemented in the transceiver, although it may be implemented elsewhere, e.g. in association with the PMA, or not implemented. If implemented within the PMD, the PMD Signal Detect status shall be reported either or both of two ways. The PMD Signal Detect function may report to the PMD service interface, using the message PMD_SIGNAL.indicate(SIGNAL_DETECT) which is signaled continuously.
PMD_SIGNAL.indicate is intended to be an indicator of optical signal presence. Or the status may be reported via the management interface. If the MDIO interface is implemented, the value of SIGNAL_DETECT may contribute to the latching link status register bit 1.2 described in 22.2.4.2.13.

If implemented, the value of the SIGNAL_DETECT parameter shall be generated according to the conditions defined in Table 60-1. If signal detect is not implemented, the value of the SIGNAL_DETECT parameter conveyed to the upper layers and management functions shall be "OK". The PMD receiver is not required to verify whether a compliant signal is being received. This standard imposes no response time requirements on the generation of the SIGNAL_DETECT parameter. It is preferable for the signal detect thresholds to be below the rated sensitivity of the receiver; they must be below the Receiver sensitivity (max) in this standard.

As an unavoidable consequence of the requirements for the setting of the SIGNAL_DETECT parameter, implementations must provide adequate margin between the input optical power level at which the SIGNAL_DETECT parameter is set to OK, and the inherent noise level of the PMD due to cross talk, power supply noise, etc.

Various implementations of the Signal Detect function are permitted by this standard, including implementations that generate the SIGNAL_DETECT parameter values in response to the amplitude of the modulation of the optical signal and implementations that respond to the average optical power of the modulated optical signal. Full Ethernet implementations which do not use a PMD signal detect, or which do not use any signal detect, must avoid noise, chatter or crosstalk creating a bogus signal with the characteristics of a real signal, which is not otherwise identified as bogus.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT. The spirit of Signal.Detect was to be compatible with clause 38 PMD types. Further, the inclusion of SD was accepted in the last meeting. If a change is necessary, the commentor is encouraged to give a technical presentation to the STF.

Cl **59** *SC* **59.2.4.1** *P* **184** *L* # **608**

Tatum, Jim Honeywell

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

tables 59-1, 59-2,59-3 are redundant

in third box down on left hand side, the <= is incorrect

SuggestedRemedy

Converge tables 59-1, 59-2,59-3

replace <= with >=

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. A single table for all 3 PMD types may be justified if the signal detect is specified in an identical fashion, and if the editor has no objection to the new document structure and style. The discrepency regarding >= and <= is addressed in another comment.

Cl **59** *SC* **59.3** *P* **186** *L* # **609**

Tatum, Jim Honeywell

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

Reference to MMF in table

SuggestedRemedy

Remove if SMF only

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT. The EX PMD includes multimode specifications.

Cl **59** *SC* **59.3** *P* **186** *L* **4** # **558**

Richard Brand Nortel Networks

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

Tests xx.yy needs efinition

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT. Replace xx.yy with 59.14

Cl **59** *SC* **59.3** *P* **186** *L* **4** # **610**
Tatum, Jim Honeywell

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**
xx.yy is not a real number

SuggestedRemedy
replace with 59.3

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

Cl **59** *SC* **59.3.1** *P* *L* # **612**
Tatum, Jim Honeywell

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**
reference to offset launch patch chord

SuggestedRemedy
Remove if SMF only

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED REJECT. The EX type is a temperature extended version of LX, which by definition includes MMF specifications.

Cl **59** *SC* **59.3.1** *P* **187** *L* **4** # **611**
Tatum, Jim Honeywell

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**
ZZ is not correct

SuggestedRemedy
replace with appropriate number

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT. replace with reference to 38.6.5 or include equivalent subclause in 59. Also replace YY with reference to 38.11.4 if including multimode.

Cl **59** *SC* **59.3.1** *P* **187** *L* **4** # **559**
Richard Brand Nortel Networks

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **D**
Eye measurement zz needs definition

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Use clause 38.6.5 as the eye mask basis

Cl **59** *SC* **59.3.1** *P* **187** *L* **40** # **561**
Richard Brand Nortel Networks

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **D**
patch cord XXX needs definition

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Pending PMD group discusion on MMF and offset patch chord.

Cl **59** *SC* **59.3.1** *P* **187** *L* **6** # **560**
Richard Brand Nortel Networks

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **D**
patch cord YY needs definition

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. See response to 561

Cl **59** *SC* **59.3.2** *P* **188** *L* **4** # **733**
Dawe, Piers Agilent

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **D** *eyeC*
The sentence "The sampling instant is defined to occur at the eye center." could be applied to the testing of an individual untimed optical transceiver but since clause 38 was written we have moved towards specifying the whole system: a "black box" with ports and interfaces. We can specify what we like but the equipment will sample where it likes, and if its choice affects sensitivity, that's part of what we are assuring. Compare clauses 52 and 53.

SuggestedRemedy
Delete this sentence, here and in 59.4.2 and 59.5.2.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. There is merit in making the change, but a STF discussion is warranted.

Cl **59** *SC* **59.3-5** *P* **187** *L* **21** # **339**

Dawe, Piers — Agilent

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

Spectral specification in table 59-8 is at present inadequate to guard against gross mode partition noise, and in table 59-11 is too tight for minimum cost. We agreed to introduce something like Fibre Channel's triple trade off. Here's my proposal, which is, overall, simpler and more robust, and designed not to trap the industry into a particular temperature range. I will illustrate it in New Orleans.
Tighten the max RMS spectral width a little to 3.5 nm. This is not enough in itself.
Define a maximum |epsilon_max| where epsilon = Dispersion.length.spectral width.Baud, of 0.168. This "must meet" limit represents an optimistic view of MPN, and is not enough in itself.
Define a second maximum |epsilon_max|, of 0.115. This is the value chosen by ITU-T in G.957, and is thought unlikely to cause more than 2 dB dispersion penalty.
Graph or tabulate what these limits mean on a (wavelength, spectral width) map, knowing the SMF spec, the 10 km reach and the 1.25 GBd line rate.
Use TDP (transmitter and dispersion penalty) methodology for assurance, particularly for implementations which fall between the two |epsilon_max| limits (likely scenario for extended temperature range parts).
Simplify the jitter test requirements where duplication with TDP is identified.
Check we are not desperate for optical budget; unless we are, don't allow the transmit power minimum to vary with transmitter spectral properties.

SuggestedRemedy

Per comment.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Need technical discussion regarding triple tradeoff curves to set PMD specification

Cl **59** *SC* **59.3-5** *P* **18793** *L* # **326**

Dawe, Piers — Agilent

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

Three reasons why the minimum extinction ratio should be lowered: the present high value is a burden to meet over a wider temperature range, it is contrary to the requirements of high speed and low dispersion penalty, and in a "system level" specification it should be measurable in service (remote fault indication? idle?) rather than the K28.7 data pattern (125 MHz square wave), so the apparent reading will be lower.

SuggestedRemedy

6 dB (all three times)

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. See response to 339

Cl **59** *SC* **59.4** *P* **189** *L* **3** # **618**

Tatum, Jim — Honeywell

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

xx.yy is not a real reference

SuggestedRemedy

change to 59.4

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **59** *SC* **59.4** *P* **189** *L* **4** # **562**

Richard Brand — Nortel Networks

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

specification xx.yy needs definition

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT. Change xx.yy to 59.14

Cl **59** *SC* **59.4** *P* **190** *L* **4** # **563**

Richard Brand — Nortel Networks

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

eye measurement ZZ needs definition

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Use clause 38.6.5 as the eye mask basis

Cl **59** *SC* **59.4** *P* **1914** *L* # **735**

Dawe, Piers Agilent

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

The stringent fast Tx risetime and limited Rx bandwidth requirements in clause 38 are to protect against the effects of ringy Tx signals exacerbated by modal dispersion in MMF. 1000BASE-BX doesn't use MMF so these specs can be relaxed significantly. I'll try to run the numbers before the meeting, but probably the risetime implied by the mask is sufficient.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete rise/fall time spec in tables 59-8, 59-11. Consider relaxing the Receive electrical 3 dB upper cutoff frequency spec in tables 59-9,12.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Pending furhter discussion on OMA and triple trade off and eye mask specifications

---

Cl **59** *SC* **59.4.2** *P* **191** *L* **3** # **620**

Tatum, Jim Honeywell

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

ZZ b ot valid

SuggestedRemedy

Change to 59.10. when clause is defined.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT. Appropriate clause reference will be inserted when the clause is defined.

Cl **59** *SC* **59.4.2** *P* **191** *L* **4** # **564**

Richard Brand Nortel Networks

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

measurement techniques ZZ need to be defined

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT. Appropriate clause reference will be inserted when the clause is defined.

Cl **59** *SC* **59.5** *P* **182** *L* **4** # **565**

Richard Brand Nortel Networks

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

specifications described in xx.yy needs definition

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT. Change xx.yy to 59.14. The commentor is encouraged to provide specific remedy in future comments.

Cl **59** *SC* **59.5.1** *P* **193** *L* **4** # **566**

Richard Brand Nortel Networks

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

eye measurement ZZ needs definition

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT. See response to 563

Cl **59** *SC* **59.6** *P* **196** *L* **table 59-1** # **567**

Richard Brand Nortel Networks

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

Incomplete values

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT. No suggested remedy.

Cl **59** *SC* **59.7** *P* **196** *L* **Table 59-1** # **568**

Richard Brand Nortel Networks

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

Incomplete values

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT. No suggested remedy.

Cl **59** *SC* **59.8** *P* **197** *L* **Table 59.1** # **569**
Richard Brand Nortel Networks

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **D**
Incomplete values

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED REJECT. No suggested remedy.

Cl **59** *SC* **59.9** *P* **198** *L* **Table 59-1** # **570**
Richard Brand Nortel Networks

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**
Incomplete values

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED REJECT. No suggested remedy.

Cl **59** *SC* **59-1** *P* **181** *L* **1** # **600**
Tatum, Jim Honeywell

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D** *Name*
Naming convention not consistent BiDirectional OLT Longwave Laser and Bidirectional Longwave ONU Laser

SuggestedRemedy
Make ONU and OLT naming the same in the title (lines 2 and 3)

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. The entire issue of naming convention is comprehensive and up to the EFM task force to decide. Please also refer to a presentation on this topic, scheduled as part of the meeting of this sub task force.

Cl **59** *SC* **59-5** *P* **187** *L* # **613**
Tatum, Jim Honeywell

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**
Text not centered in table

SuggestedRemedy

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

Cl **59** *SC* **59-5** *P* **187** *L* # **614**
Tatum, Jim Honeywell

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**
Text not centered in table

SuggestedRemedy
Center text

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

Cl **59** *SC* **59-5** *P* **187** *L* **40** # **615**
Tatum, Jim Honeywell

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**
XXX is not a value, and it references offset patch chord

SuggestedRemedy
Rmove if no MMF, or correct numbering

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT. replace XXX with reference to 38.11.4 if including multimode.

Cl **59** *SC* **60** *P* **210** *L* **33** # **338**
Dawe, Piers Agilent

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D** *Name*
Need better descriptors in place of "-OLT" and "-ONU". While they are rubbish descriptors for a PON, here where we are dealing with a point-to-point link they have no bearing at all. However, while it cannot be compulsory, it may be convenient to associate the two PMDs types to some concept of head and tail or centre and periphery or top and bottom.

SuggestedRemedy
Suggestions welcome! Also need to say what "upstream" and downstream" (60.14.2) mean.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Discuss in New Orleans in conjunction with naming presentation (diab_optics_1_0902)

Cl **59** *SC* **ALL** *P* *L* # **616**

Tatum, Jim — Honeywell

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

Is MMF included in specification?

SuggestedRemedy

Include refernces for using MMF on all variants (Bidi included)

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Specifications for EX and BX are differen. However, the sub task force agreed to proceed with considering EX as a superset of LX, therefore inclusive of MMF specifications. The BX is specified for SMF operation only.

Cl **59** *SC* **Table 59-10** *P* **192** *L* **14** # **248**

Jönsson, Ulf — Ericsson AB

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

The minimum range shall be 0.5 to 10000 meters and not 2 to 10000 meters. This vote was unanimously passed in the Vancouver Plenary and should according to the document "notestotheeditor_clause60_0702.doc" be applied to all EFM PMDs.

SuggestedRemedy

Minimum range (meters) = 0.5 to 10000

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **59** *SC* **Table 59-16** *P* *L* # **624**

Tatum, Jim — Honeywell

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

TP1 and TP4 are not valid

SuggestedRemedy

Remove reference to TP1 and TP4

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT. The comment is vague about the meaning of the word "valid" in this context. The sub task force is encouraged to debate whether these two test points need to be normative or informative.

Cl **59** *SC* **Table 59-5,8,11** *P* **18793** *L* # **337**

Dawe, Piers — Agilent

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

To ease network maintenance on a mixed 100/1000 Ethernet /OC-3 network, the OFF transmit powers (and hence the signal detect limits) in the standard may be aligned. The average launch power of OFF transmitter (max) should be the same as the FAIL Signal detect value in clause 60. Apparently this is no problem; disabled transmitters don't seem to leak light.

SuggestedRemedy

-50 or -45 dBm to match clause 60.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT. The PMD types are independent, and should be specified independently. Some implementations may only turn off AC to laser.

Cl **59** *SC* **Table 59-7** *P* **189** *L* **14** # **247**

Jönsson, Ulf — Ericsson AB

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D** *MinRange*

The minimum range shall be 0.5 to 10000 meters and not 2 to 10000 meters. This vote was unanimously passed in the Vancouver Plenary and should according to the document "notestotheeditor_clause60_0702.doc" be applied to all EFM PMDs.

SuggestedRemedy

Minimum range (meters) = 0.5 to 10000

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **60** *SC* *P* *L* # **342**

Dawe, Piers — Agilent

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

Would we do better to specify end-to-end channel attenuation rather than length and dB/km?

SuggestedRemedy

Discuss!

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. The PMD STF needs to discuss this. It is a valid question that has been brought up in the PMD STF before without any clear decision.

Cl **60** *SC* *P* **209** *L* **15** # **254**

Dawe, Piers Agilent

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

Update 1.4.15 definition of 100BASE-X. (This comment is entered against clauses 1 and 60.)

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT. The Clause 1.4.15 definition of 100BASE-X needs to be modified, including a reference to Clause 60.

Cl **60** *SC* *P* **209** *L* **8** # **386**

Bhatt, Vipul (Not Applicable)

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

Please refer to Editor's Note: "Keep Clauses 60.6 and 60.7 (worst-case power budget and link penalty tables) for now, remove them prior to final publication."

I think it will be wise to keep those tables. They act as a quick reference, an executive summary of a link's design. For those trying to understand PMD specification tables, the link budget tables provide a quick application example, which helps promote understanding. If there is any discrepancy between link model spreadsheet and these tables, we can either remove the discrepancy or use suitable words to highlight how to resolve it. Overall, the benefit of keeping those informative tables is more than the cost.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete the note.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The PMD STF needs to discuss this topic. The vote to include the editor's note was unanimously passed at the EFM Vancouver Plenary.

Cl **60** *SC* **15** *P* **224** *L* **39** # **440**

John George OFS

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

table reference is blank

SuggestedRemedy

Replace XX with 60-20.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **60** *SC* **60** *P* **209** *L* **2** # **252**

Dawe, Piers Agilent

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

"Laser" should not be in the title. Use of lasers is an implementation choice, not a requirement of the standard.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace "Longwave Laser" with "Long Wavelength", three times here and in 60.16.4.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. This will partly be addressed in a presentation about naming by Wael Diab.

A naming convention and definition of the single-fiber PMD sublayer and baseband medium package is needed. The PMD STF needs to discuss this.

Cl **60** *SC* **60** *P* **209** *L* **2** # **253**

Dawe, Piers Agilent

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D** *Name*

Title is over long and not strictly correct. Each PMD sublayer and baseband medium is one package, not a separate item for each direction.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace "100BASE-BX-OLT (BiDirectional OLT Longwave Laser) and 100BASE-BX-ONU (BiDirectional Longwave ONU Laser)" with "100BASE-BX (BiDirectional Long Wavelength)", here and in 60.16.4.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

This is to be discussed in conjunction with the naming presentation.

Cl **60** *SC* **60** *P* **210** *L* **33** # **286**

Dawe, Piers Agilent

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D** *Name*

Need better descriptors in place of "-OLT" and "-ONU". While they are rubbish descriptors for a PON, here where we are dealing with a point-to-point link they have no bearing at all. However, while it cannot be compulsory, it may be convenient to associate the two PMDs types to some concept of head and tail or centre and periphery or top and bottom.

SuggestedRemedy

Suggestions welcome! Also need to say what "upstream" and downstream" (60.14.2) mean.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

For P2P links it is important to avoid confusion with PON nomenclature.

Naming will be addressed by a presentation by Wael Diab.

A naming convention for how to associate the two single-fiber PMDs types is needed. The PMD STF needs to discuss this.

Cl **60** *SC* **60** *P* **212** *L* **13** # **274**

Dawe, Piers Agilent

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

Our fibre experts tell us that the nomenclature "10 um" SMF is deprecated, as nothing is necessarily 10 um. Anyway it's unnecessary.

SuggestedRemedy

Search and eliminate all "10 um". Occasionally you may need to say "Type B1.1, B1.3 SMF", but in nearly all cases, just "SMF" will do fine.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **60** *SC* **60** *P* **212** *L* **26** # **276**

Dawe, Piers Agilent

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

"Transmitter type Longwave Laser": Use of lasers, or a particular type, is an implementation choice, not a requirement of the standard. Later in a receiver table it is even less appropriate.

SuggestedRemedy

Search and eliminate the lines "Transmitter type Longwave Laser": in at least six tables.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **60** *SC* **60** *P* **212** *L* **9** # **279**

Dawe, Piers Agilent

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

Tables 60-4,7,10 are redundant, with each other and just redundant, needed only when there are different fiber types e.g. in Clause 38.

It would be better to put just one table in 60.1 with columns:

Port type, Nominal wavelength, Number of fibres, Fiber type, Minimum range

SuggestedRemedy

As above. You can refer to the new table 1 from 60.3,4,5.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. This will not only remove redundances but will also make the specification easier to read.

Cl **60** *SC* **60.1** *P* **209** *L* **37** # **256**

Dawe, Piers Agilent

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

No point mentioning MDI here: the term hasn't been introduced in this clause and our definition of it is not significant in terms of an overview. Clause 52 does without it.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete "(including MDI)".

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

It is true that the word MDI is not significant to mention in the overview. However, Clause 60 does indeed include a definition of the MDI in Clause 60.15.3.

Cl **60** *SC* **60.1** *P* **209** *L* **37** # **236**

Jönsson, Ulf Ericsson AB

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D** *Name*

There does not exist a 100BASE-BX PMD

SuggestedRemedy

Change either to "100BASE-BX-OLT PMD and 100BASE-BX-ONU PMD" or "100BASE-BX PMD set"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Suggest "a pair of 100BASE-BX PMDs". Later in the paragraph, explain that the two ends of 100BASE-BX differ and are used together (they are not alternatives like PON A and B), give their names and nominal wavelength information - preferably in an overview table.

Cl **60** *SC* **60.1** *P* **209** *L* **37** # **257**

Dawe, Piers Agilent

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

"baseband medium for single-mode fiber." needs rewording. "baseband" is not true, the information modulates an optical carrier, and not necessary, we have only one modulation format in the context. "medium for single-mode fiber" is wrong: the medium IS single-mode fiber.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace "baseband medium for single-mode fiber." with "medium, single-mode fiber."

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Change of description may be inconstitant with historical description. A more detailed discussion on the topic is needed.

Cl **60** *SC* **60.1** *P* **209** *L* **38** # **258**

Dawe, Piers Agilent

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

"complete Physical Layer, it": what is "it"? There are several PMDs here.

SuggestedRemedy

"complete Physical Layer, a PMD"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **60** *SC* **60.1** *P* **209** *L* **39** # **260**

Dawe, Piers Agilent

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

Management Interface is not mandatory. See Cl. 52 and 22 or 45.

SuggestedRemedy

Add "optionally" and "may be" viz: "and optionally integrated with the management functions which may be accessible"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

It is correct that the Management Interface is optional and the text has to be modified accordingly.

Cl **60** *SC* **60.1** *P* **209** *L* **39** # **259**

Dawe, Piers Agilent

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

24*ref*

SuggestedRemedy

Make the cross-reference and delete the "*ref*".

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT..

Make cross-reference to Clause 24.

Cl **60** *SC* **60.1** *P* **209** *L* **41** # **261**

Dawe, Piers Agilent

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

Which Management Interface yy? Choice is 22, 45, create a new one, SFP, ... 22 is not used on 100M optics modules, and we don't really want to create a new one. Clause 45?

SuggestedRemedy

Clause 45?

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

More work needed on this topic by the 100M Ad-hoc

Cl **60** *SC* **60.1.1** *P* **210** *L* **1** # **263**

Dawe, Piers Agilent

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

Add more words "in normal service.". Later on we can show that the baseline wander pattern is a sufficiently rare occurrence that in tests with it we can test to a worse BER than the service BER.

SuggestedRemedy

Add more words "in normal service.".

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

This discussion to follow the decision on BER value.

Cl **60** *SC* **60.1.1** *P* **210** *L* **1** # **262**
Dawe, Piers Agilent

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

"Optical EFM" is confusing; there are no other PHYs in this clause.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

This current text is directly compied from the EFM objectives but does not make any sense here.

Cl **60** *SC* **60.1.1** *P* **210** *L* **1** # **264**
Dawe, Piers Agilent

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

10^-12 BER can't really be necessary, being one (detected) error in two hours. It would be expensive to test for and remarkably hard to extrapolate reliably, though in practice (without the guarantee in the standard) it will be met cost-effectively. I understand the underlying technical reason for demanding very low BERs is to avoid TCP running slow when it sees dropped packets. 10^-10 or 10^-11 seems enough. Other 100Mb/s PHYs use on the order of 10^-10.

SuggestedRemedy

Consider a more traditional BER limit for all 100M PHYs.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The PMD STF needs to discuss the technical and economical feasibility for specifying a BER of 10^-12 for all 100Mbps PHYs, especially in terms of testing.

Cl **60** *SC* **60.10** *P* **219** *L* **31** # **300**
Dawe, Piers Agilent

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

Anything wrong with a shorter SMF patch cord for optical tests? If there is, need to explain.

SuggestedRemedy

Change 2 to 0.5.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.
It is reasonable to change to 0.5 as this is the minimum allowed distance.

Cl **60** *SC* **60.10.1** *P* **219** *L* **35** # **301**
Dawe, Piers Agilent

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

Need to explain that the BLW pattern is more brutal than normal service.

SuggestedRemedy

Add text: "Transmit eye mask and sensitivity are to be assured against the test pattern defined in 60.10.1.1. This represents an extremely untypical pattern. The BER in service can be expected to be more than 100? 1000? times lower than with the test pattern.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Since clause 24, more information is can be presented to the STF.

Cl **60** *SC* **60.10.1** *P* **219** *L* **45** # **302**
Dawe, Piers Agilent

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

Unwanted space

SuggestedRemedy

4B/5B

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **60** *SC* **60.10.12** *P* **222** *L* **1** # **308**
Dawe, Piers Agilent

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

Need to describe TDP measurement. This may mean that we don't need so many jitter measurement sections. TDP sensitivity measurements should be done with an AC coupled receiver and with a CDR. AC coupling somewhere above 1.4 kHz to experience the BLW. As it turns out, the dispersion penalty can be made really small at this line rate.

SuggestedRemedy

Start with Clause 52. In text, mention that implementers may be able to avoid testing with dispersion by showing that the spectral properties of their transmitters cannot create significant penalty.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

If the PMD STF decides to incorporate the TDP measurement the suggested text is appropriate since dispersion is likely to not be an issue at this slow line rate.

Cl **60** *SC* **60.10.4** *P* **220** *L* **34** # **327**

Dawe, Piers Agilent

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

The pattern for extinction ratio conformance could be:
1. a special pattern for extinction ratio conformance (no point),
2. the test pattern used for e.g. eye margin and sensitivity testing (convenient to combine with eye margin measurement but not conveniently accessible in service), or
3. the pattern a station naturally emits when not receiving an optical input (accessible in service).
My choice is for (3). The question remains, what is that pattern? is it idles with a low concentration of OAM frames? or is it far end fault indication, with or without the OAM frames? If the latter, what exactly is the (majority) bit stream on the line?

SuggestedRemedy

Find out what a 100BASE-X optical port (will) emit(s) when no optical input. Use that for extinction ratio tests (and for mean power, if we have to be specific).

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. More work needed on this topic by the 100M Ad-hoc.

Cl **60** *SC* **60.10.5** *P* **220** *L* **42** # **303**

Dawe, Piers Agilent

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

text needed

SuggestedRemedy

start from clause 52

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The PMD STF has not yet decided whether or not to specify OMA. If they decide to specify OMA we need to add text here starting out from the Clause 52 text as suggested.

Cl **60** *SC* **60.10.6** *P* **220** *L* **46** # **304**

Dawe, Piers Agilent

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

text needed

SuggestedRemedy

TBD

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

If OMA is specified text needs to be added.

Cl **60** *SC* **60.10.7** *P* **220** *L* **50** # **305**

Dawe, Piers Agilent

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

RIN_12_OMA preferred

SuggestedRemedy

Refer to clause 52, with frequencies and rates as appropriate.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The PMD STF needs to discuss this.

One of the comments mentioned that if a TDP measurement is specified RIN becomes redundant. If so, the PMD STF needs to discuss whether we need to specify RIN at all for 100M.

Cl **60** *SC* **60.10.8** *P* **220** *L* **37** # **306**

Dawe, Piers Agilent

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

XX kHz. This is the jitter corner mentioned previously

SuggestedRemedy

20 kHz

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

There are currently three proposed values for the jitter corner frequency:
1) 20 kHz
2) 25 kHz
3) Above 64 kHz

Please refer to comment 55

Cl **60** *SC* **60.10.8** *P* **221** *L* **39** # **341**

Dawe, Piers Agilent

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

We have forgotten to say that the test should be carried out with a lower low frequency cut than the pattern frequency of 1.38 kHz. A DC coupled receiver is fine, and DCAs typically are DC coupled, so there's no problem.

SuggestedRemedy

Add sentence: "The frequency response of the measurement instrument (e.g. oscilloscope) should extend substantially lower than the test pattern repetition frequency. A DC coupled instrument is convenient."

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

This needs to be stated for the 100M PMDs bacuse of the BLW effect.

Cl **60** *SC* **60.10.9** *P* **220** *L* **44** # **307**

Dawe, Piers Agilent

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

Need text. Use the worst case test pattern. With this line code, errors will be caused mainly in association with baseline wander; the BER in test will be worse than in service by a few orders of magnitude, depending how frequently a really BLW-heavy sequence is experienced in normal service. This is probably less than 1% of the time. Would anyone like to calculate it? Or try an experiment on a Fast Ethernet link?

SuggestedRemedy

Start with Clause 52. Use the test pattern, which exercises BLW. Seek to modify the test pattern so that it acts as our jitter test pattern at the same time. Use BER limit in test of 10^-9 (TBC).

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.

The current objective is 10e-12. A change of objective is appropriate through the AH TF.

Cl **60** *SC* **60.11.2** *P* **222** *L* **15** # **311**

Dawe, Piers Agilent

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

Not all 100BASE-X optical transceivers are subject to this clause, not all need contain lasers.

SuggestedRemedy

"A 100BASE-LX or 100BASE-BX transceiver described by this clause which contains a laser shall ..."

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **60** *SC* **60.13** *P* **222** *L* **40** # **312**

Dawe, Piers Agilent

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

Avoid wasting virtual paper, and readers' time. "use" should be "user".

SuggestedRemedy

Replace whole contents of subclause with:
"It is recommended that each PHY (and supporting documentation) be labeled in a manner visible to the user, with at least the applicable safety warnings and the applicable port type designation (e.g., 100BASE-BX-ONU).

Labeling requirements for Class 1 lasers are given in the laser safety standards referenced in 60.11.2."

(The last sentence is unchanged.)

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **60** *SC* **60.13** *P* **222** *L* **40** # **313**

Dawe, Piers Agilent

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

Why do we have 60.11 Environmental specifications followed by 60.12 Environment ? Looks like our document structure needs updating.

SuggestedRemedy

Downgrade the latter to 60.11.4 Environment .

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The bulk of the environmental contents will be included in a future version of the draft under the environmental annex. C60 will be modified accordingly.

Cl **60** *SC* **60.13** *P* **224** *L* **1** # **314**

Dawe, Piers — Agilent

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

Simplifying and completing.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete the subheadings 60.14.1-2 and the two associated sentences. use one multi-column table like in clauses 38 and 52. Use separate columns for upstream and downstream. Check that we have introduced those terms. Replace "10000 m" with "10 km", "1520" with "1550". Channel insertion losses are 6 or 7 dB TBD at 1310, 6 dB at 1550 nm.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The editorial part of the comment is accepted.

Need to discuss if it is appropriate to make a simplification by making nominal wavelength equal specification wavelength. Also need to decide what channel insertion loss value to pick.

Cl **60** *SC* **60.15** *P* **224** *L* **39** # **315**

Dawe, Piers — Agilent

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

XX

SuggestedRemedy

60-20

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **60** *SC* **60.15.2** *P* **224** *L* **52** # **316**

Dawe, Piers — Agilent

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

XX

SuggestedRemedy

60-2

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Figure 60-2 does not show the connection. Either the figure needs to be modified or the text needs to be modified.

Cl **60** *SC* **60.15.2** *P* **224** *L* **52** # **245**

Jönsson, Ulf — Ericsson AB

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

I believe Figure XX should be Figure 60-2. However, Figure 60-2 does not depict the optical fiber connection. The text has obviously been copied from Clause 38.11.2 where Figure 38-7 shows the connection.

SuggestedRemedy

Either remove or modify the text to not reference Figure 60-2. Alternatively modify the picture to show the "connection".

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Figure number to be included. Further, the STF to review the diagram.

Cl **60** *SC* **60.15.2** *P* **225** *L* **5** # **317**

Dawe, Piers — Agilent

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

G.652 allows 0.5 dB/km at low bit rates; we copied its specification for OC-192 which is overkill here. Other minor changes and completions.

SuggestedRemedy

Change 1520 to 1550. Ask the fiber experts how to describe SMF for 1550 nm use. Unless advised otherwise:
Remove the "0.4* or" and both footnotes.
Insert 1550 attenuation, 0.4.
Change "Dispersion slope" to "Dispersion slope at zero dispersion wavelength".
Straddle the two dispersion entries to cover both wavelengths.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Need to discuss if it is appropriate to make a simplification by making nominal wavelength equal specification wavelength.

Need to ask the fiber experts how to describe SMF for 1550 nm use.

The suggestion to change "Dispersion slope" to "Dispersion slope at zero dispersion wavelength" and straddle the two dispersion entries to cover both wavelengths is an appropriate action.

Cl **60** *SC* **60.15.2.1** *P* **225** *L* **19** # **318**

Dawe, Piers Agilent

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

Filling a gap, simplification by making nominal wavelength equal specification wavelength.

SuggestedRemedy

Allocation for connection and splices: change XX to 2.
Change 1520 to 1550.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Setting the value for total connection and splice losses to 2 dB is accepted as it is a well known practice.

Need to discuss if it is appropriate to make a simplification by making nominal wavelength equal specification wavelength.

Cl **60** *SC* **60.15.2.1** *P* **225** *L* **19** # **598**

Nguyen, Trung National Semiconduct

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

Insertion loss for connectors and splices

SuggestedRemedy

2.0dB total

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **60** *SC* **60.15.2.1** *P* **225** *L* **24** # **246**

Jönsson, Ulf Ericsson AB

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

Adopt a value of 26 dB for the return loss of single-mode connections in order to be consistent with 1000BASE-LX.

SuggestedRemedy

The return loss for single-mode connections shall be greater than 26 dB.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. However following current industry practice, should say Maximum discrete reflectrance, less than, -26 dB. See comment 319.

Cl **60** *SC* **60.15.2.2** *P* **225** *L* **22** # **319**

Dawe, Piers Agilent

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

Using current industry-standard nomenclature and generalising to allow optical switches etc. I think -26 dB is the right number, which I think comes from a campus wiring spec while the connector spec is -27. All this at 1G, not sure if it changes for 100M.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "Connection return loss" to "Maximum discrete reflectance".

Change text to "The Maximum discrete reflectance shall be less than –26 dB."

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

A value of 26dB should be appropriate for consistency and forward compatibility with 1000BASE-LX.

"Connection Return Loss" is the terminology used by e.g. 1000BASE-LX. The PMD group needs to discuss what terminology is preferred.

Cl **60** *SC* **60.15.2.2** *P* **225** *L* **24** # **599**

Nguyen, Trung National Semiconduct

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

Return loss for a connection. To avoid having to specify special polish or angled connectors, a low value should be set.

SuggestedRemedy

Should be > 30dB min

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Refer to comments 319 and 246

Cl **60** *SC* **60.16.1** *P* **226** *L* **12** # **322**

Dawe, Piers Agilent

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

21*ref*

SuggestedRemedy

Make the cross-reference and delete the "*ref*".

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **60** *SC* **60.2** *P* **210** *L* **17** # **265**

Dawe, Piers Agilent

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D** *Name*

"The 100BASE-X PMDs": there are other 100BASE-X PMDs, see clauses 25 and 26.

SuggestedRemedy

"The 100BASE-X PMDs of this clause" or "The PMDs of this clause"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **60** *SC* **60.2.1** *P* **210** *L* **24** # **268**

Dawe, Piers Agilent

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

"... TP1 and TP4 will be common between 100BASE-LX, 100BASE-BX-OLT, and 100BASE-BX-ONU." The reader will benefit in knowing that they might be common with 100BASE-FX too.

SuggestedRemedy

" ... 100BASE-BX-OLT, 100BASE-BX-ONU, and 100BASE-FX." See another comment against OLT and ONU.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **60** *SC* **60.2.1** *P* **210** *L* **24** # **266**

Dawe, Piers Agilent

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

x and y. y is 5m. x could be 0.5 m (the minimum reach) or 2m, as used elsewhere in the clause.

SuggestedRemedy

0.5m, 5m

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

It is clear that y shall be 5m. Further, it is reasonable to specify x = 0.5m which is the minimum distance.

Progress made by ad-hoc on patch cord issue to be reviewed by STF.

Cl **60** *SC* **60.2.1** *P* **210** *L* **24** # **267**

Dawe, Piers Agilent

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

"of a type consistent with the link type connected to the transmitter." is a left over from a dual purpose MMF/SMF PMD. There's only one fibre type here.

SuggestedRemedy

"of single mode fiber."

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **60** *SC* **60.2.1** *P* **210** *L* **29** # **237**

Jönsson, Ulf Ericsson AB

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

Add a picure showing the 100BASE-X block diagram including the test points TP1, TP2, TP3, and TP4.

SuggestedRemedy

Adopt Figure 38-1, 1000BASE-X block diagram.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Take the best features of figures 38-1 and 52-2. 38-1 shows TP1-4, 52-2 does not show connectors and connector polarities which are not specified in this clause (and in the case of 38-1, TP2, are against common building wiring practice) The same remarks may apply to Cl.59.

Cl **60** *SC* **60.2.4** *P* **210** *L* **48** # **269**

Dawe, Piers Agilent

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

Signal detect: it's universal at present but if EFM is to aspire to a first mile in a consumer market, every pin and mW needs to be scrutinised and possibly jettisoned. See GR-253 for how PMD signal detect need not be mandatory. The standard does not have enough reason for demanding that the function be implemented in the PMD (although implementers may choose to insist on it), nor that the signal detect status be reported in duplicate, though a physical pin and through a management interface. Signal detect is not the primary way of detecting breaking links; these are detected by noting a "run of zeroes" (coding violation).
Also it's nice if signal detect operates below sensitivity.

SuggestedRemedy

Check that 24 as modified is compatible with the following.
Suggested text for 60.2.4:
The signal detect function is traditionally implemented in the transceiver, although it may be implemented elsewhere, e.g. in association with the PMA, or not implemented. If implemented within the PMD, the PMD Signal Detect status shall be reported either or both of two ways. The PMD Signal Detect function may report to the PMD service interface, using the message PMD_SIGNAL.indicate(SIGNAL_DETECT) which is signaled continuously.
PMD_SIGNAL.indicate is intended to be an indicator of optical signal presence. Or the status may be reported via the management interface. If the MDIO interface is implemented, PMD_global_signal_detect (1.10.0) is (may be?) continuously set to the value of SIGNAL_DETECT as described in 45.2.1.9.5.

If implemented, the value of the SIGNAL_DETECT parameter shall be generated according to the conditions defined in Table 59-1. If signal detect is not implemented, the value of the SIGNAL_DETECT parameter conveyed to the upper layers and management functions shall be "OK". The PMD receiver is not required to verify whether a compliant signal is being received. This standard imposes no response time requirements on the generation of the SIGNAL_DETECT parameter. It is preferable for the signal detect thresholds to be below the rated sensitivity of the receiver; they must be below the Receiver sensitivity (max) in this standard.

As an unavoidable consequence of the requirements for the setting of the SIGNAL_DETECT parameter, implementations must provide adequate margin between the input optical power level at which the SIGNAL_DETECT parameter is set to OK, and the inherent noise level of the PMD due to cross talk, power supply noise, etc.

Various implementations of the Signal Detect function are permitted by this standard, including implementations that generate the SIGNAL_DETECT parameter values in response to the amplitude of the modulation of the optical signal and implementations that respond to the average optical power of the modulated optical signal. Full Ethernet implementations which do not use a PMD signal detect, or which do not use any signal detect, must avoid noise, chatter or crosstalk creating a bogus signal with the characteristics of a real signal, which is not otherwise identified as bogus.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

This issue has been discussed within the 100M ad hoc group but no conclusion has yet been made. The PMD STF needs to debate this issue.

Cl **60** *SC* **60.2.4** *P* **210** *L* **51** # **309**

Dawe, Piers Agilent

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

Backwards inequality. Clarify which sensitivity.

SuggestedRemedy

"Input_optical_power >=" Use the proper Greater than or equal to symbol, ALT-0179, per "List of special symbols", page vi.

Replace "Receive sensitivity" with "Receiver sensitivity (max) in Table 60-6, Table 60-9 or Table 60-12".

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Will check and bring forward to STF.

Cl **60** *SC* **60.2.4** *P* **210** *L* **51** # **270**

Dawe, Piers Agilent

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

The three PMDs have similar sensitivities so unless some new information comes up they can share the same table. -45 dBm is de facto standard, though a lower value would be consistent with it and would be more forward looking, allowing longer reach implementations.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete the three subclauses like
"60.2.4.1 100BASE-LX signal detect functions
The Signal Detect value definitions for the 100BASE-LX PMD are shown in Table 60-1",
put Table 60-1 in 60.2.4, delete tables 60-2,3.

Replace -XX dBm with "-50 dBm average power".

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Vlues to be decided by STF.

Cl **60** *SC* **60.2.4.1** *P* **211** *L* **25** # **589**

Nguyen, Trung National Semiconduct

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

Table 60-1 Input optical power for FAIL condition not determined.
Same for Tables 60-2 and 60-3

SuggestedRemedy

Should set to <= -30dBm for all three tables

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Vlues to be decided by STF

Cl **60** *SC* **60.2.4.1** *P* **211** *L* **7** # **590**

Nguyen, Trung National Semiconduct

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D** *Sdsign*

Input optical power for OK Signal Detect Value states "<=" in Table 60-1. Same comment for Tables 60-2 and 60-3.

SuggestedRemedy

Should read ">= max receive sensitivity as stated in Table 60-6" for Table 60-1, and ref respective Tabled for Tables 60-2 and 60-3.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **60** *SC* **60.3,4,5** *P* **212** *L* **4** # **271**

Dawe, Piers Agilent

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

xx.yy should be

SuggestedRemedy

60.15 (three times)

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **60** *SC* **60.3.1** *P* **212** *L* **38** # **243**

Jönsson, Ulf Ericsson AB

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

Adopt a value of -45 dBm for "Average power of OFF transmitter (max)" which is the same value as suggested for signal detect = FAIL. This is similar to how this value has been specified for 1000BASE-LX.

Some might argue that we could as well pick a lower value but I've checked that at least one FDDI transceiver specifies -45 dBm and I cannot see any reason to exclude any existing or future components.

SuggestedRemedy

Average power of OFF transmitter (max) = -45 dBm

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. It should not be higher than -45 dBm. Let's quickly check to see if a value nearer -50 dBm would be more future proof. Note several related comments against 58-60. See 239 and other comments.

Cl **60** *SC* **60.3.1** *P* **212** *L* **38** # **591**

Nguyen, Trung National Semiconduct

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

No value for Avg launch power of Off Transmitter (max). Should use same value as Signal Detect limit, if for no other reason.

SuggestedRemedy

Add "-30dBm".

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Applying the signal detect FAIL value for Avg launch power of Off Transmitter (max) is appropriate. However, the value is likely to be equal or less than -45 dBm and not -30 dBm as suggested.

Cl **60** *SC* **60.3.1** *P* **212** *L* **40** # **592**

Nguyen, Trung National Semiconduct

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

Is there a reason why the Min Extinction Ratio value of 6dB cannot be reduced to a lower value? I cannot remember how we ended up with 6dB , but I'm sure there was discussions about having this lower. Is it because we wanted the present limit on the Launch OMA min figure ? Maybe somewhere between 6dB and 3dB e.g. 4.5dB may be acceptable.

SuggestedRemedy

Reduce ER to Min to 3dB.
Then Launch OMA min (line 43) and Receive OMA min in Table 60-6, needs to be changed to 0.0211 mW (-16.76dBm) also.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.

The value of 6dB ER is low enough to remove performance uncertainty. Further discussion by STF when OMA and ER issues are taken up.

Cl **60** *SC* **60.3.1** *P* **212** *L* **45** # **597**

Nguyen, Trung National Semiconduct

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

Table 60-5, Transmitter eye mask definition should read X1, X2, X3, Y1, Y2, 1-Y2, 1-Y1.
Also, this is the mask which should be met under the worst case DC wander test conditions.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to "(X1, X2, X3, Y1, Y2, 1-Y2, 1-Y1).
Last two values should be change to 0.62 and 0.65
Add comment that this eye mask should be used with the bit pattern to be specified.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT. The current Figure 60-1-Transmitter eye mask definition is correct, i.e. {X1, X2, X3, Y1, Y2, Y3, Y4}, and the table calls them correctly. Tabulating 1-Y2, 1-Y1 would be including the same information twice which is unnecessary.

Cl **60** *SC* **60.3.2** *P* **212** *L* **52** # **734**

Dawe, Piers Agilent

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

The sentence "The sampling instant is defined to occur at the eye center." could be applied to the testing of an individual untimed optical transceiver but since clause 38 was written we have moved towards specifying the whole system: a "black box" with ports and interfaces. We can specify what we like but the equipment will sample where it likes, and if its choice affects sensitivity, that's part of what we are assuring. Compare clauses 52 and 53.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete this sentence, here and in 60.4.2 and 60.5.2.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **60** *SC* **60.3.2** *P* **213** *L* **16** # **593**

Nguyen, Trung National Semiconduct

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

Should state that this is a min value for Return Loss. Is this the return loss of light reflected back into the fiber from the receiver module? Should be labelled "Receiver Reflectance" ?

SuggestedRemedy

Add "(min)" to Return Loss.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
There are four options here:
1) Keep "Return Loss (min)" - This is consistent with 1000BASE-LX terminology
2) Replace with "Receiver reflectance (max)"
3) Keep "Return Loss (min)" and add a footnote explaining what we mean
4) Replace with "Receiver reflectance (max)" and add a footnote explaining what we mean

Cl **60** *SC* **60.3.2** *P* **213** *L* **22** # **594**

Nguyen, Trung National Semiconduct

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

Add value receiver for 3dB cut-off freq. max in Table 60-6

SuggestedRemedy

Max of 150MHz

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.

See comment 310.

Cl **60** *SC* **60.3-5** *P* **212** *L* **28** # **280**

Dawe, Piers Agilent

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

We think we mean +/-100 ppm but in 24.2.3.4 there seems to be a mention of +/-50 ppm.

SuggestedRemedy

Reconcile. May wish to change the old stuff.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Selection of +/- 100ppm is consistant with Clause 36 and 10G PMA.

Cl **60** *SC* **60.3-5** *P* **2126** *L* # **321**

Dawe, Piers Agilent

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

The table is the best place to state the transmitter's Optical Return Loss Tolerance. Do we need a Transmitter Reflectance spec?

SuggestedRemedy

Insert into transmitter tables, Optical Return Loss Tolerance (max), 12, dB.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The PMD STF needs to discuss this issue.

Cl **60** *SC* **60.3-5** *P* **2137** *L* # **320**

Dawe, Piers Agilent

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

Using nomenclature from clause 52 which was discussed at length and I think is compatible with current industry-standard nomenclature. One reason for the change was that under their previous names the readers could not understand what the transmitter's Optical Return Loss Tolerance and
Transmitter Reflectance were about.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "Return loss, 12" to "Receiver Reflectance (max), -12".

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

There are four options here:
1) Keep "Return Loss (min)" - This is consistent with 1000BASE-LX terminology
2) Replace with "Receiver reflectance (max)"
3) Keep "Return Loss (min)" and add a footnote explaining what we mean
4) Replace with "Receiver reflectance (max)" and add a footnote explaining what we mean

Cl **60** *SC* **60.3-5** *P* **2137** *L* # **325**

Dawe, Piers Agilent

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

Do we need a stressed sensitivity spec? It was used in gigabit and 10 gigabit because signals impaired by MMF, chromatic dispersion and technical difficulty were to be used. The test procedure was quite onerous for state-of-the-art optics. Here, can we expect that the transmitter eye will be of a higher standard? Or will the procedure be less onerous (more cost effective) because the line rate is much slower than the state of the art? We have already recognised the big stressor which is the line code.

SuggestedRemedy

For discussion!

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

This is a valid point. More work needed on this topic by the 100M Ad-hoc

Cl **60** *SC* **60.3-5** *P* **217** *L* **20** # **295**

Dawe, Piers Agilent

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

These three subclauses are unnecessarily repetitive. The text and the first table in each subclause is identical. Much of the remaining tables are too. It will help the reader if they are combined into five-column tables: see Table 38–7 for an example.

SuggestedRemedy

Merge the subclauses and the tables.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.

Document structure is consistant with previous clauses. It was reviewed at the previous meeting. If a more suitable change is required, further discussion is welcome at the STF.

Cl **60** *SC* **60.4** *P* **213** *L* *#* **289**

Dawe, Piers Agilent

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

At present we are copying TS-1000 for power levels but saying the objective is 10 km while TS-1000 does 15 km. These statements are contradictory: a standard cannot demand things it doesn't need, or if it demands them it must put them to use. In the following comments I show how spec values which are compatible with TS-1000, but less onerous, can deliver our present 10 km objective, with a spec power budget reduced from 16 dB to 9 dB (1550 band) and 9 or 10 dB (1310 band). Part of the reduction is a sleight of hand: we are defining a worst-pattern sensitivity. Alternatively we could choose another reach in the range 10 to 15 km.

SuggestedRemedy

Use spec values for a 10 km link which are compatible but less onerous than TS-1000.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

This is a very valid concern and needs to be addressed by the PMD STF.

Cl **60** *SC* **60.4-5** *P* **214** *L* **24** *#* **290**

Dawe, Piers Agilent

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

The Extinction ratio (min) of 9 dB here appears to be a mistake: TS-1000 has the traditional SONET value of 8.2 dB. However, the SONET value is higher than is truly cost effective even for a typical line code. With the high baseline wander in our 4B/5B code, a much lower value is appropriate.

SuggestedRemedy

6 dB, in Tables 60-8 and 60-11

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

These are valid points which needs to be discussed in the PMD STF. Need to check with liason.

Cl **60** *SC* **60.4-6** *P* **2137** *L* *#* **310**

Dawe, Piers Agilent

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

Receive electrical 3 dB upper cutoff frequency (max) is to guard against split pulses fooling a high bandwidth receivers. The significant causes of pulse splitting are modal dispersion in multimode fibre (not applicable here) and strong laser resonance in band. In practice the latter does not seem to be a concern at 125 MBd. I see three options:
Keep this spec item but set the limit high enough for future multi-rate implementations: say 750 MHz.
Remove this spec item and demand a mask assurance with -n% margin, without the standard filter,
Relax. Just remove this spec item.
The issues are the same for all three PMDs so the solution should be the same.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove this spec item? Three times.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Need to discuss the three options in the PMD STF.

Cl **60** *SC* **60.6-7** *P* **217** *L* **20** *#* **297**

Dawe, Piers Agilent

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

These two subclauses are unnecessarily repetitive. The text and much of the tables in each subclause is identical. It will help the reader if they are combined into a five-column table: see Table 38–7 for an example.

SuggestedRemedy

Merge the subclauses and the tables.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.

Document structure is consistant with previous clauses. It was reviewed at the previous meeting. If a more suitable change is required, further discussion is welcome at the STF.

Cl **60** *SC* **60.6-7** *P* **217** *L* **23** # **296**

Dawe, Piers Agilent

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

These subclauses are to be removed before final publication.
The channel insertion loss assumption at 1310 nm is 2 dB connectors + 10 km * {0.5 or 0.4 dB/km}, making 6 or 7 dB. For 1550 nm it's 6 dB. The power budgets are 9 and 10 dB to suit. Either way, we should not say "worst-case": quoting power budgets at extreme wavelengths causes endless confusion. Also, the budget in question is due partly to the terminals and partly to the channel (link), so calling it a "link power budget" is confusing.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace "The worst-case" with "An illustrative". Delete "link" from subclause title, line 25, 33 and 38, add "to be removed before final publication". Insert 6 or 7 for Channel insertion loss in tables 60-13. If necessary, split table 60-14's "10 µm SMF" column (bad title anyway) into two columns; insert 6, and 6 or 7. In table 60-14, replace "16" with "9" and {9 or 10} depending on decisions on 100BASE-BX power levels. In both tables, replace "10000 m" with "10 km". In both tables, replace "Unallocated" with "Reserved". Later on we will decide what to do with it: allow it to be used as attenuation or kept as part of the Allocation for penalties.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The EFM TF has already voted in favour of removing these subclauses. However, a request has been made to revisit this decision. The PMD STF needs to discuss this issue.

Cl **60** *SC* **60.8** *P* **217** *L* **50** # **595**

Nguyen, Trung National Semiconduct

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **D** *fJit100*

High Freq jitter above 637Khz

SuggestedRemedy

Change to above 25KHz

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

It is obvious that this value needs to be changed. There are currently three proposed values on forth:
1) 20 kHz
2) 25 kHz
3) Above 64 kHz

Please refer to comment 55

Cl **60** *SC* **60.8** *P* **217** *L* **50** # **298**

Dawe, Piers Agilent

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **D** *fJit100*

Jitter above 637 kHz is wrong. We think that following clause 24(?) it should say 20 kHz.

SuggestedRemedy

20 kHz

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

It is obvious that this value needs to be changed. There are currently three proposed values on forth:
1) 20 kHz
2) 25 kHz
3) Above 64 kHz

Please refer to comment 55

Cl **60** *SC* **60.8** *P* **218** *L* # **596**

Nguyen, Trung National Semiconduct

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

Use FDDI specs for jitter

SuggestedRemedy

Total Transmit Deterministic Jitter at TP2 = 1.6nS max (includes DCD jitter and DDJ)
Total Transmit Random Jitter at TP2 = 0.76nS max
Total Receive Deterministic Jitter at TP3 = 2.2 nS max
Total Receive Random Jitter at TP3 = 0.76nS max

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

More work needed on this topic by the 100M Ad-hoc.

Cl **60** *SC* **60.8,9** *P* **217** *L* **51** # **299**

Dawe, Piers — Agilent

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

For a system level spec using SMF, there should not be normative jitter specs in this style. TP1 and TP4 are to be informative, and common to 100BASE-FX, 100BASE-LX, 100BASE-BX. TP2 and TP3 are better measured by TDP not by jitter bathtub.

SuggestedRemedy

Change title of 60.8 to "Jitter at TP1 and TP4 for 100BASE-LX and 100BASE-BX (informative)".
Replace "Implementations shall conform to the normative values highlighted in bold in Table 60-15 (see measurement procedure in 60.10). All other values are informative." with "The informative Table 60-15 shows jitter specifications used in FDDI which may be of interest to implementers." In table 60-15, add "(informative)" to the title, delete five rows, populate rows TP1 and TP4 with FDDI values.
Delete 60.9 with its table 60-16.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

TP1 and TP4 are already informative.

A presentation about "Jitter bathtub vs. TDP measurements" has been prepared by Piers Dawe.

Cl **60** *SC* **60.9** *P* **219** *L* **3** # **55**

Bhatt, Vipul — (Not Applicable)

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **D** *fJit100*

Jitter corner frequency of 637 KHz is too high for 100 Mb/s operation. Correct value will be more than 20 KHz, as hinted by subclause 24.2.3.4, and less than 64 KHz, as suggested by the thumb rule of data_rate/1667 used by Fibre Channel and Gigabit Ethernet. Industry practice seems to be in the range of 30 to 50 KHz. I suggest we pick a value that does better justice than the current 637 KHz, and in later drafts we can pin the value down more accurately.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace "above 637 KHz" with "above 64 KHz".

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
It is obvious that this value needs to be changed. There are currently three proposed values on the table:
1) 20 kHz
2) 25 kHz
3) Above 64 kHz

Please refer to comment 55

Cl **60** *SC* **Header** *P* **209** *L* **23** # **53**

Mickelsson, Hans — Ericsson AB

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D** *Name*

I propose a change of name for 100BASE-BX_OLT and 100BASE-BX-ONU to 100BASE-BDX and 100BASE-BUX respectively. Where D stands for downlink and U stands for uplink.
The reason for this proposed change is to avoid confusion with PON nomenclature which by tradition use OLT and ONU in their naming schemes. The proposed change will refelct that this PMD (clause 60) will only be used for point-to-point links.

SuggestedRemedy

Physical Medium Dependent (PMD) sublayer and baseband medium type 100BASE-LX (Longwavelength Laser), 100BASE-BDX (BiDirectional Downlink Laser) and 100BASE-BUX (BiDirectional Uplink Laser)

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. To be discussed in conjunction with the naming discussion/presentation.

Cl **60** *SC* **Table 60-1** *P* **211** *L* **5** # **239**

Jönsson, Ulf — Ericsson AB

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

Adopt a value of <= -45 dBm for signal detect FAIL. This is the value for signal detect deassert typically used by current STM-1, OC-3 and 100M FDDI transceivers.

This value has been agreed upon in the 100M ad hoc group.

SuggestedRemedy

Input_optical_power <= -45 dBm

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. It should not be higher than -45 dBm. Let's quickly check to see if a value nearer -50 dBm, , or a specification by function e.g. "Optical connector is disconnected or when the link partner is OFF or powered down", would be more future proof. Note several related comments against 58-60.

Cl **60** *SC* **Table 60-1** *P* **211** *L* **7** # **240**

Jönsson, Ulf — Ericsson AB

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D** *Sdsign*

Correction: "<" should be corrected to ">".

SuggestedRemedy

Input_optical_power >= Receive sensitivity AND compliant 100BASE-X signal input

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. >= but use the proper symbol per page vi.

Cl **60** *SC* **Table 60-1** *P* **211** *L* **9** # **238**

Jönsson, Ulf — Ericsson AB

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

It is not clear what we mean by "compliant 100BASE-X signal input". This should preferrably be clarified in a footnote.

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. change to "compliant 100BASE-LX signal" or if the tables are combined, "compliant 100BASE-LX or 100BASE--BX signal upstream or downstream as appropriate". Further disucssion on suitable conditions under which SD is specified may be appropriate in STF.

Cl **60** *SC* **Table 60-12** *P* *L* # **144**

Seto, Koichiro — Hitachi Cable

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

it is better to have a footnote explaining why we adopt receive center wavelength of 1480-1600 rather than 1480-1580.

SuggestedRemedy

add a footnote such as
"Note x: Center wavelength range allowing wavelength up to 1600nm is defined to achieve backword compatibility with an existing bi-directional standard, TTC TS-1000. TS-1000 optionally allows the use of optics which center wavelength is 1500 to 1600nm."

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. This is a comment of editorial nature, suitable wording to be discussed by the group.

Cl **60** *SC* **Table 60-12** *P* **217** *L* **20** # **294**

Dawe, Piers — Agilent

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

As well as the minimum transmit power being be reduced, the sensitivity can be relaxed from -30 dBm, for 10 km (part of the difference is because this standard will likely define a sensitivity with the stressful test pattern, and sensitivity is pattern dependent with 4B/5B). This allows more budget for the WDM components (hidden from the standard behind the MDI). This is still a "mean power parallelogram" mean power oriented spec but I have expressed the minimum power in OMA also, like 100BASE-LX. Because the link attenuation is expected to differ at 1310 and 1550 nm, either the transmit power or sensitivity should differ for the two 100BASE-BX PMDs. Here I suggest making the sensitivities differ.

SuggestedRemedy

Pave -26 dBm at 6 dB extinction ratio = -25.2 dB OMA or 3.00 uW.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

These are valid points which needs to be discussed in the PMD STF. Need to check with liason.

Cl **60** *SC* **Table 60-12** *P* **218** *L* **2** # **51**

Mickelsson, Hans — Ericsson AB

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

The link power budget of 16 dB is a bit high. With such a high link budget the goal of low cost components will be though to meet. Consider a 10 km link (total 5 dB loss) toghether with some margins (3dB) and also some connector loss (2 dB) that will give a 10dB link budget that will be sufficient.

SuggestedRemedy

10 dB

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Budget could be changed,however, a demonstration of the economic benefits would be required.

Cl **60** *SC* **Table 60-18** *P* **224** *L* **6** # **250**

Jönsson, Ulf — Ericsson AB

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

I don't understand this table completely. How do I know that my channel insertion loss is EFM compliant if the fiber is shorter than 10 km? Wouldn't it be better to specify a maximum channel insertion loss and don't care about the distance?

SuggestedRemedy

Remove operating distance and specify maximum channel insertion loss.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. You know because the cable characteristics in Table 60-20 constrain the loss/km. However, it appears that operators of cabling bigger than a campus (e.g. telcos) think in terms of end-to-end loss which they measure - and campuses don't need 10 km links. But that information is in in Table 60-18 and -19. We should consider moving from a distance based spec to a loss & dispersion based spec, like telecoms generally. We would start by generalising the sentence at p223 line 35 to address distance and dispersion. We might have to express the dispersion slope in Table 60-20 in ps/nm2.

Cl **60** *SC* **Table 60-19, Table 60-2** *P* **224** *L* **28** # **52**

Mickelsson, Hans — Ericsson AB

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

The use of 1520 nm as nominal wavelength doe not make any sense. Either it shall be changed to be in between 1480 and 1580 i.e. to the nominal value 1530. Or even better it should be changed to 1550 to be more compliant with existing measuring point for optical fibers. By using the latter a standard OTDR measurement set can be used.

SuggestedRemedy

Nominal Wavelength - Downstream 1550 nm

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. The standard specs a range of operation; which seems to be adequate. We do need a nominal wavelength, 1550 nm is commonly used and is well within the wavelength range.

Cl **60** *SC* **Table 60-2** *P* **211** *L* **27** # **241**

Jönsson, Ulf — Ericsson AB

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D** *Sdsign*

Correction: "<" should be corrected to ">".

SuggestedRemedy

Input_optical_power >= Receive sensitivity AND compliant 100BASE-X signal input

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. see response to comment 240

Cl **60** *SC* **Table 60-3** *P* **211** *L* **45** # **242**

Jönsson, Ulf — Ericsson AB

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D** *Sdsign*

Correction: "<" should be corrected to ">".

SuggestedRemedy

Input_optical_power >= Receive sensitivity AND compliant 100BASE-X signal input

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. see response to comment 240

Cl **60** *SC* **Table 60-4** *P* **212** *L* **13** # **275**

Dawe, Piers — Agilent

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D** *Sdsign*

"Minimum range (meters), 0.5 to 10000" will attract the style police

SuggestedRemedy

Minimum range
0.5 m to 10 km

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. The editor to verify the current best practice.

Cl **60** *SC* **Table 60-5** *P* **212** *L* **41** # **244**

Jönsson, Ulf — Ericsson AB

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **D** *RIN100*

Adopt a value of -110 dB/Hz for RIN (max). This value was agreed upon in the 100M ad hoc group.

Note: 100BASE-BX specifies RIN (max) = -120 dB/Hz. Is there any reason to why RIN for 100BASE-BX and 100BASE-LX cannot be the same?

SuggestedRemedy

RIN (max) = -110 dB/Hz

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. RIN12OMA is a better metric. -110 is a good limit for RIN12OMA.

Cl **60** *SC* **Table 60-5** *P* **212** *L* **41** # **282**

Dawe, Piers Agilent

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **D** *RIN100*

Need a value for RIN (max). From the model, -110 dB/Hz gives a 0.3 dB penalty which seems OK.
dB(RIN12OMA) = dB(RIN12) + 2*dB(P_ExtinctionRatio). Thus we are at about RIN<-115 dB/Hz. With a TDP spec, strictly, RIN is redundant but we might feel safer with a RIN spec. RIN should be replaced with RIN12OMA as in clause 52 (the "12" in subscript).

SuggestedRemedy

RIN12OMA, -110

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

A RIN12OMA = -110 dB/Hz is reasonable for 100BASE-LX. RIN should preferrably be the same for both 100BASE-LX and 100BASE-BX. However, 100BASE-BX currently specifies RIN to -120 dB/Hz. The PMD STF needs to investigate if it is possible to specify the same RIN value for all 100M PMDs.

Further, if RIN is considered redundant (as hinted by the comment) the PMD STF also needs to discuss whether we need to specify RIN at all for 100M.

Cl **60** *SC* **Table 60-5** *P* **212** *L* **43** # **283**

Dawe, Piers Agilent

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

I think it helps the reader to see the transmit OMA in dBm as well as mW. It may not be good style to use a number <<1. Four significant figures are not justifiable.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to 37.9 uW. Add "-14.2 dBm"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **60** *SC* **Table 60-5,8,11** *P* **2126** *L* # **329**

Dawe, Piers Agilent

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

The eye mask should be the same for all three 100-BASE-X PMDs.

SuggestedRemedy

Double-check that the eye mask timing dimensions are consistent with FDDI's TP1,4 jitter specs. Copy mask coordinates from Table 60-5 to 60-8 and 60-11 (or better, combine the tables).

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

More work needed on this topic by the 100M Ad-hoc.

Cl **60** *SC* **Table 60-5,8,11** *P* **2126** *L* # **281**

Dawe, Piers Agilent

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

Average launch power of OFF transmitter (max) should be the same as the FAIL Signal detect value earlier.

SuggestedRemedy

-50 or -45 dBm to match. I guess this can be the same in tables 60-8,11 also.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Value seems OK. Need to check with appropriate liason.

Cl **60** *SC* **Table 60-6** *P* **213** *L* **14** # **284**

Dawe, Piers Agilent

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

OMA sensitivity is wrong: should be 0.00379 not 0.0379 mW. I think it's not good style to use such tiny numbers anyway. And, I think it helps the reader to see the OMA in dBm as well as mW.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to 3.79 uW. Add "-24.2 dBm"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **60** *SC* **Table 60-6** *P* **213** *L* **14** # **249**

Jönsson, Ulf Ericsson AB

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

The Receiver OMA (min) should be corrected from .0379 mW to .00379 mW.

SuggestedRemedy

Receiver OMA (min) = .00379 mW

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Agree with commenter but prefer to quote this one in uW not mW. See comment 208.

Cl **60** *SC* **Table 60-8** *P* **214** *L* **20** # **292**

Dawe, Piers Agilent

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

The minimum transmit power can be reduced from 14 dBm, and the sensitivity relaxed, for 10 km. This allows more budget for the WDM components (hidden from the standard behind the MDI). This is still a "mean power parallelogram" mean power oriented spec but I have expressed the minimum power in OMA also, like 100BASE-LX.

SuggestedRemedy

Pave -16 dBm at 6 dB extinction ratio = -15.2 dB OMA or 30.0 uW, in Tables 60-8 and 60-11.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

These are valid points which needs to be discussed in the PMD STF. Need to check with liason.

Cl **60** *SC* **Table 60-8** *P* **214** *L* **26** # **291**

Dawe, Piers Agilent

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **D** *RIN100*

The RIN (max) is tighter than needed; e.g. Gigabit Ethernet gets by with -117 (short wavelength) or -120 (long wavelength), and slower links can have higher RIN per Hz. From the model, RINOMA=-110 dB/Hz gives a 0.3 dB penalty which seems OK. dB(RIN12OMA) = dB(RIN12) + 2*dB(P_ExtinctionRatio). Thus we would be at about RIN<-115 dB/Hz. With a TDP spec, strictly, RIN is redundant but we might feel safer with a RIN spec. RIN should be replaced with RIN12OMA as in clause 52 (the "12" in subscript).

SuggestedRemedy

RIN12OMA, -110 dB/Hz, in Tables 60-8 and 60-11

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The PMD STF needs to discuss this issue.

Cl **60** *SC* **Table 60-9** *P* **215** *L* **20** # **293**

Dawe, Piers Agilent

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

As well as the minimum transmit power being be reduced, the sensitivity can be relaxed from -30 dBm, for 10 km (part of the difference is because this standard will likely define a sensitivity with the stressful test pattern, and sensitivity is pattern dependent with 4B/5B). This allows more budget for the WDM components (hidden from the standard behind the MDI). This is still a "mean power parallelogram" mean power oriented spec but I have expressed the minimum power in OMA also, like 100BASE-LX. Because the link attenuation is expected to differ at 1310 and 1550 nm, either the transmit power or sensitivity should differ for the two 100BASE-BX PMDs. Here I suggest making the sensitivities differ.

SuggestedRemedy

Pave -25 dBm at 6 dB extinction ratio = -24.2 dB OMA or 3.79 uW.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

These are valid points which needs to be discussed in the PMD STF. Check with liason.

Cl **61** *SC* **2.2** *P* *L* # **145**

Shah, Sunil Voyan Technology

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

PHY loop aggregation function is essentially defined above the gamma interface. This implies that if a particular PHY operates on more than one copper pair, as in an HDSL-4 PHY or vectored PHY, it could still take advantage of the PHY loop aggregation function. In that case, a PHY loop does not necessarily mean one copper pair; it merely means one PHY interface at the TPS-TC interface even if it operates over multiple copper pairs.

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Pending suggested remedy.

Cl **61** *SC* **61.1** *P* *L* **4** # **10**

Marris, Arthur Cadence Design Syste

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

Second sentence might read better if reworded.

SuggestedRemedy

Try rewording second sentence to read:
"These PHYs deliver a minimum of 10 Mb/s over distances of up to 750 metres, and a minimum of 2 Mb/s over distances of 2700 metres, using a single copper pair."

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **61** *SC* **61.1** *P* *L* **8** # **11**
Marris, Arthur Cadence Design Syste

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

Delete ", however"

SuggestedRemedy

Delete ", however"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **61** *SC* **61.1** *P* **230** *L* **12** # **419**
Wei, Dong SBC Communications,

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

The usage of "only possible" is incorrect.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace "only possible" by "conventional".

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **61** *SC* **61.1** *P* **230** *L* **3** # **200**
Zion Shohet Infineon

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

10PASS-TS reffers to both QAM and DMT sections.
For purpose of clarity and convinience, better to use different notation to each of them, as is done for the long reach objectives.
This is till we have only one technology.

SuggestedRemedy

For example- 10PASS-TS-Q for QAM and 10PASS-TS-D for DMT.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT. Need further discussion

Cl **61** *SC* **61.1** *P* **230** *L* **4-5** # **390**
Edward Beili Actelis Networks

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

Current wording does not mention the “multi-pair” nature of Long range Ethernet over copper.

SuggestedRemedy

The medium specifications are aimed at users who want to deliver minimum of 2 Mb/s over single copper pair for at least the distance of 2700 meters, and 10 Mb/s over single copper pair for at least the distance of 750 meters, respectively. The medium specifications (for delivering Ethernet traffic for distances beyond 2700 meters, or rates higher than 2 Mbps and 10 Mbps respectively) are aimed to support transmission over multi copper-pairs.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **61** *SC* **61.1** *P* **230** *L* **7** # **417**
Wei, Dong SBC Communications,

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

The usage of "This system" is incorrect.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace "This system is" by "These systems are".

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **61** *SC* **61.1** *P* **230** *L* **9** # **418**
Wei, Dong SBC Communications,

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

2BASE-TL et al. are systems rather than signals.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace "transmission of such signals over public loop plants" by "deployment of these systems in public access networks".

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT. 2 PASS-TL, 2BASE-TL, 10PASS-TS are transmission methods. Need further discussion

Cl **61** *SC* **61.1.2** *P* **230** *L* **34-35** # **391**

Edward Beili — Actelis Networks

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

Current wording specifies BER and SNR, which is a redundant specification. The SNR is not important as long as the communication channel achieves BER of 10E-7. The wording “with a 6dB noise margin at the PMA service interface.” should be omitted.

SuggestedRemedy

d) To provide a communication channel with a mean bit error rate of less than one in part in 10E7.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT. This is consistent with the way transmission methods are developed and specified

---

Cl **61** *SC* **61.1.4.1** *P* **230** *L* **44** # **634**

Barrass, Hugh — Cisco Systems

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

This section should include a diagram showing the relationship of the 2 functions and one sublayer. Also the clock domains should be shown with a brief description of the rate matching mechanism (frame-based).

SuggestedRemedy

Insert text and diagram for subclause 61.1.4.1 from file Comment_hb_61.1.4.1.fm

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT. Not sure how the picture adds new info without further details. Do not see any problem to accept STF Accepts

---

Cl **61** *SC* **61.1.4.1.1** *P* *L* **49** # **12**

Marris, Arthur — Cadence Design Syste

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

Replace the word "mechanism" with "function"

SuggestedRemedy

Replace the word "mechanism" with "function"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **61** *SC* **61.1.4.1.2** *P* **231** *L* **15** # **407**

Jackson, Stephen — Hatteras Networks

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

Generally, Clause 61 will change in content as the definition of the aggregation methodology is refined. This especially refers to the ending sentence, referring to subclause 61.2.2

SuggestedRemedy

Strike last sentence in subclause 61.1.4.1.2

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **61** *SC* **61.1.4.2** *P* **231** *L* **30** # **201**

Zion Shohet — Infineon

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

Change to "summary of Handshaking and PHY control specification"

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT. Need clarification

Cl **61** *SC* **61.2.1.2.1** *P* *L* **35** # **13**

Marris, Arthur — Cadence Design Syste

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

Table 23-1 should be placed here

SuggestedRemedy

Insert table 23-1 or insert text saying "See 23.2.2.1"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **61** *SC* **61.2.1.3** *P* *L* **1** # **14**

Marris, Arthur — Cadence Design Syste

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

State diagrams need to be supplied

SuggestedRemedy

I will supply a suggested remedy in a separate email.

See marris_c1_0902.pdf.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **61** *SC* **61.2.2** *P* **233** *L* **28** # **396**

Jackson, Stephen Hatteras Networks

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

I'd rather see a more sensible number, like 2-24 PHYs. 32 sounds good because it's a power of two, but in reality, 24 is the maximum.

SuggestedRemedy

Chage "32" to "24."

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT. 24 is a subset of 32

Cl **61** *SC* **61.2.2.2** *P* **234** *L* **33** # **397**

Jackson, Stephen Hatteras Networks

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

This subclause elements (a-f) effectively contradict subclause 61.2.2 (a-f) on the page immediately before it.

SuggestedRemedy

Strike, in favor of an update pending the approval of any new baseline updates.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT. Need clarification on how they contradict each other. Need further discussion

Cl **61** *SC* **61.2.2.2** *P* **234** *L* **36** # **640**

Barrass, Hugh Cisco Systems

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

Item c) - "determines NumPHYs" is incomplete - this must be specified

SuggestedRemedy

Replace item c) with:

Determines NumPHYs, the number of PHYs that are currently functional, as the number of bits asserted in the logical AND of PMD_Aggregate_Register and Aggregation_Link_State_Register.

Aggregation_Link_State_Register will be defined in another comment.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT. New technical input/ could affect implementation. Need further discussion and acceptance from STF

Cl **61** *SC* **61.2.2.2** *P* **234** *L* **40** # **641**

Barrass, Hugh Cisco Systems

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

This section does not deal with the case where NumPHYs = 1 - i.e. no aggregation is happening.

SuggestedRemedy

Item e), insert before the words "Adds a Loop Aggregation Function header"

"If NumPHYs is >1,"

Thus reading:

e) If NumPHYs is >1, adds a Loop Aggregation Function header ...

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **61** *SC* **61.2.2.2** *P* **234** *L* **43** # **103**

Beck, Michael Alcatel

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

The PTM-TC is not able to assert its ability to accept a LAF fragment from the LAF. The Tx_Enbl signal of the gamma-interface asserts ability to accept data on a per-byte basis. This is not compatible with the "no backpressure" requirement as described in function f.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the "no backpressure" requirement (point f), and start transmitting data as soon as any of the PHYs asserts its ability to accept an octet.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **61** *SC* **61.2.2.2 - 61.2.2.6.5** *P* **233 - 240** *L* **All** # **389**

Edward Beili — Actelis Networks

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

The method described for PHY Loop Aggregation has a few significant disadvantages in features that are required from an “Ethernet over copper” system.

Efficiency (loop utilization) and overhead - as can be seen in fosmark_1_0302.pdf (slide 12), the loop utilization is poor for packets in the size range of small to medium for every number of loops. In addition, the loop utilization is below what is presented in fosmark_1_0302.pdf (slide 12) due to (1) significant losses of residual BW caused by discrepancy between the aggregated loop BW, the Ethernet BW and the packet sizes and (2) additional header and trailer information that is required (and missing in fosmark_1_0302.pdf) in order to identify the beginning and end of the fragments.
Just think of the fact that loop utilization of 50% means twice the number of copper pairs for a given BW, or half the BW for a given number of copper pairs. Therefore loop utilization is a critical factor when evaluating aggregation methods.
Alternative PHY Loop Aggregation method can achieve overhead of 1% to 4% dependent on the packet size (= loop utilization of 99% to 96%) regardless the number of loops.

Resiliency and Ethernet throughput - TCP-IP throughput has strong and proven dependence on the channel BER and delay characteristics.
Nominal BER for an xDSL system is usually 10^-7. A single xDSL modem may suffer from excessive BER as a result of many phenomena characteristic to the Copper plant, including Impulse noise, Micro-interruptions, introduction of new wide-band services in the same binder (Alien NEXT), etc. These phenomena may be transient or steady-state and may further increase the BER. Therefore incorporating FEC into multi-pair DSL system is of vital importance for achieving high TCP-IP throughput and acceptable UDP stream quality.
The method described in 61.2.2.x is not built for adding “System FEC” (FEC that is added to the Ethernet packets stream as a whole, and not separately to each loop).
The alternative PHY Loop Aggregation method includes “System FEC” that adds 5% overhead (to a total of 6% - 10% overhead). Such “System FEC” allows minimum BER of 10E-12 for the Ethernet service.

SuggestedRemedy

The alternative method mentioned above will be presented and discussed in the coming EFM meetings, and shall be detailed here as a remedy afterwards.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT. Pending presentation

Cl **61** *SC* **61.2.2.2 - 61.2.2.6.5** *P* **233 - 240** *L* **All** # **393**

Edward Beili — Actelis Networks

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

The Fragment structure described in fosmark_1_0302.pdf does not have means required to identify the beginning and end of each fragment.

SuggestedRemedy

To allow identification of the beginning and end of each fragment at the receiver side, additional header and trailer information is required. Note that this adds additional overhead.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT. Need further clarification

Cl **61** *SC* **61.2.2.2 - 61.2.2.6.5** *P* **233 - 240** *L* **All** # **392**

Edward Beili — Actelis Networks

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

The EFM protocol encapsulation as well as the fragmentation and reassembly procedures described in fosmark_1_0302.pdf enable “point to point” transmission, but do not allow for “point to multi point” transmission. In order to allow transmission between a single Central Office node and many CPE nodes (each CPE is connected to the CO with few copper pairs), the CO as receiver has to distinguish between the links (link = CO to CPE multi-pair channel) in order to enable correct fragments to packets assembly.

SuggestedRemedy

It is required to add to the EFM header that contains the fields SeqNum, TotalFrag and FragNum another field LinkNum that contains the link number (5 bits to allow up to 32 links, equal to the maximum number of loops). Note that this adds additional overhead.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT. There is no point to multi-point requirements

Cl **61** *SC* **61.2.2.3** *P* **235** *L* **10** # **202**

Zion Shohet — Infineon

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

change '... frame with 4 out more ...' to '... frame with 4 or more ...'

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **61** *SC* **61.2.2.3** *P* **235** *L* **10** # **398**

Jackson, Stephen Hatteras Networks

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

I don't understand the meaning of "an invalid frame with 4 our (sic) more octets between flags"

SuggestedRemedy

Cite explanation of why this is an error.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **61** *SC* **61.2.2.3** *P* **235** *L* **13** # **642**

Barrass, Hugh Cisco Systems

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

There needs to be a definition of the maximum allowable latency skew between aggregated links. This will bound the size of buffers required for this function.

SuggestedRemedy

Insert paragraph:

The PMD control of aggregated links must ensure that the maximum latency difference between any two aggregated links correponds to no more than 64,000 bit times. This must be achieved by adjusting the bit rate, error correction and interleaving functions in the PMA/PMD of each link. Note that the burst noise protection offered by the error correction and interleaving functions is directly proportional to the latency, therefore it is logical that multiple aggregated links in the same environment should be optimized to have the similar latencies.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **61** *SC* **61.2.2.3.1** *P* **235** *L* **27** # **399**

Jackson, Stephen Hatteras Networks

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

Parenthetical phrase redundant (with or without...)

SuggestedRemedy

strike

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **61** *SC* **61.2.2.4** *P* **236** *L* **21** # **643**

Barrass, Hugh Cisco Systems

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

There needs to be mention of the registers and functions associated with them. Clause 45 gives most of the definition but more is required here.

The operation of these registers is described in the separate presentation.

SuggestedRemedy

Add a new subclause 61.2.2.4.3 PHY loop aggregation register functions

Clause 45 defines 2 registers which relate to the PHY loop aggregation function: PMD_Available_register and PMD_Aggregate_register. Additionally the remote_discovery_register and Aggregation_link_state_register must be implemented.

The PMD_Available_register is a read-only (for LT) register which indicates whether an aggregateable link is possible between this PCS and multiple PMD's. As a minimum, for a device that does not support aggregation, bit zero of this register must be set and all other bits clear. The position of bits indicating aggregateable PMD links correspond to the PMA/PMD sub-address defined in Clause 45.

For NT devices, the PMD_Available_register may optionally be writeable. The reset state of the register must reflect the capabilities of the device. The management entity (through Clause 45 access) may clear bits which are set to limit the mapping between MII and PMI for loop aggregation. For NT devices, links must not be enabled until the PMD_Available register has been set to limit the connectivity such that each PMI maps to one, and only one MII. Multiple PMI's per MII are allowed.

The PMD_Aggregate_register is defined in Clause 45. For LT devices, access to this register is through Clause 45 register read and write mechanisms. For NT devices the register may be read locally through Clause 45, reads and writes must be allowed from remote devices via the remote access signals passed across the gamma interface from the PMA (through the OC). The operation of the PMD_Aggregate_register for NT devices is defined as follows:

a) If the remote_discovery_register is clear then the PMD_aggregate_register must be cleared.
b) If write_PMD_Aggregation_reg is asserted, the contents of remote_write_data bit zero is written to PMD_Aggregation_register in the bit location corresponding to the PMA/PMD from which the request was received. Acknowledge_read_write is asserted for one octet clock cycle.
c) If read_PMD_Aggregation_reg is asserted, the contents of PMD_Aggregation_register are placed onto remote_read_data bus, bits 31 through 0. Unsupported bits are written as zero if the full width of PMD_Aggregation_register is not supported. Acknowledge_read_write is asserted for one octet clock cycle.

The remote_discovery_register must be implemented for NT devices. The remote_discovery_register may be read locally through Clause 45 register access mechanisms. The remote_access_register must support atomic write operations and reads from remote devices according via the remote access signals passed across the gamma interface from the PMA (through the OC). The operation of the remote_discovery_register for NT devices is defined as follows:

a) If read_remote_discovery_reg is asserted, the contents of remote_discovery_register are placed onto remote_read_data bus. Acknowledge_read_write is asserted for one octet clock cycle.
b) If write_remote_discovery_reg is asserted, the action depends on the contents of remote_discovery_register:
If the remote_discovery_register is currently clear (no bits asserted), the contents of the remote_write_data bus are placed into the remote_discovery_register. The new contents of remote_discovery_register are placed on the remote_read_data bus. Acknowledge_read_write is asserted for one octet clock cycle.
Else if the remote_discovery_register is not currently clear (any bit asserted), no data is written. The old contents of remote_discovery_register are placed on the remote_read_data bus. NAcknowledge_read_write is asserted for one octet clock cycle.
If multiple write_remote_discovery_reg signals are asserted (from multiple gamma interfaces) they must be acted upon serially.
c) If clear_remote_discovery_reg is asserted, the remote_discovery_register is cleared. The new contents of remote_discovery_register are placed on the remote_read_data bus. Acknowledge_read_write is asserted for one octet clock cycle.
d) If the logical AND of the Aggregation_link_state_register and the PMD_Aggregate_register is clear then a timeout counter must be started. If this condition continues for 30 seconds (the timeout period) then the remote_discovery_register must be cleared.

Note that a single device may be implemented which has multiple MII interfaces and (therefore) multiple PCS instances. There must be one remote_disovery_register per PCS instance. The PMD_available register must be set prior to the enabling of links so that each PMA/PMD is linked to only one PCS. Access to the remote_discovery_register (read or write) must be restricted to PMA/PMD instances for which the corresponding PMD_available register bit is asserted.

The Aggregation_link_state_register is a pseudo-register corresponding to the PCS_link_state bits from each gamma interface in the appropriate bit positions according to the PMA/PMD from which the signal is received. Bits corresponding to unsupported aggregation connections are zero.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT. Pending presentation

Cl **61** *SC* **61.2.2.4.1** *P* **236** *L* **13** # **646**

Barrass, Hugh Cisco Systems

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

There needs to be a method defined for passing the Loop Aggregation Function header (LAFH) across the gamma interface. In particular, there must be a means of identifying whether the LAFH is present (loops are being aggregated) or not (only a single loop is being used).

SuggestedRemedy

The definition for this should be in the section that defines the gamma interface, in this subclause the following paragraph should be added:

The mechanism for passing the LAF header across the gamma interface is defined in subclause 61.2.3.1.1

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT. Pending presentation

Cl **61** *SC* **61.2.2.5** *P* **236** *L* **27** # **203**

Zion Shohet Infineon

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

change " frame sequence number (10 bits) for MAC frame", to, "MAC frame sequence number (10 bits).

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **61** *SC* **61.2.2.5** *P* **236** *L* **31** # **204**

Zion Shohet Infineon

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

figure 3 is refferenced. Yet, there is no such figure. Should be added.

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Will discuss figure at STF

Cl **61** *SC* **61.2.2.6.2** *P* **237** *L* **8** # **205**

Zion Shohet Infineon

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

change "10 bit unsigned" to "5 bit unsigned"

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **61** *SC* **61.2.2.6.3** *P* **238** *L* **6** # **206**

Zion Shohet Infineon

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

"no timers are defined ...". This seems incorrect. Timers might be needed.
See 61.2.2.3.1, page 235, line 53.

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **61** *SC* **61.2.3** *P* **241** *L* **13-41** # **394**

Edward Beili Actelis Networks

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

Figure 61-5 (Functional model of TC sublayer) does not describe OAM entity (CPU) access directly to the PMD layer (DSL modem layer). Such access is required in order to allow OAM entity communication between both sides of the link through the EOC channel of the DSL modems, before an Ethernet traffic link is established.

SuggestedRemedy

Add to Figure 61-5 (Functional model of TC sublayer) description of OAM entity access to the PMD layer. It can be stated that such access to the DSL modem EOC channel is required in order to allow OAM entity communication between both sides of the link.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT. It is not clear if OAM layer needs to interact below alpha/beta interface. Need further discussion at STF

Cl **61** *SC* **61.2.3.1** *P* **241** *L* **54** # **649**

Barrass, Hugh Cisco Systems

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

A signal is required to cross the gamma interface from the TC to the PMT to indicate that the link is active for the PMD loop aggregation function. The normal link state accessible through Clause 30 (or 45) would not be available quickly enough for this purpose.

SuggestedRemedy

Add paragraph:

An additional signal is required which would be represented in the referenced document section H.3.1.4.

signal: PCS_link_state
size: 1 bit
direction: TC -> PTM entity
description: control signal asserted when link is active and framing has synchronized according to the definition in subclause 61.2.3.2.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Need clarification on "quickly enough." Require further discussion at STF

Cl **61** *SC* **61.2.3.1** *P* **242** *L* **54** # **647**

Barrass, Hugh Cisco Systems

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

There needs to be a method defined for passing the Loop Aggregation Function header (LAFH) across the gamma interface. In particular, there must be a means of identifying whether the LAFH is present (loops are being aggregated) or not (only a single loop is being used).

Additionally, section H.3.1.2 does not fully specify the SOP and EOP signalling.

SuggestedRemedy

Add paragraph:

The end of packet signals (Rx_EOP, Tx_EOP) are asserted for one octet clock cycle coincident with the last valid data octet of the packet (the final CRC byte).

The start of packet signals (Rx_EOP, Tx_EOP) are asserted for one octet clock cycle coincident with the first valid data octet of the packet (the first DA byte) unless a Loop Aggregation Function header is present.

If an LAF header is present, the 3 bytes of the LAF header are inserted before the first data byte of the packet. The start of packet signals (Rx_EOP, Tx_EOP) are asserted for 4 octet clock cycle coincident with the LAF header and the first valid data octet of the packet.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Need to Accept with the group if this is acceptable

Cl **61** *SC* **61.2.3.1.1** *P* **241** *L* # **652**

O'Mahony, Barry — Intel Corp.

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

Immunity to undetected frame errors is insufficient with the current 16-bit CRC as specified in the PTM-TC (see omahony_1_0502). ITU-T would prefer a stronger CRC here, rather than additional FEC indication (see latest liaison letter).

SuggestedRemedy

Specify a 32-bit CRC for the TPS-TC layer, in conjunction with ITU-T Q4/15. This needs to be different than the 802.3 CRC. Possibility is the CRC-32C used in iSCSI; see "iSCSI CRC/Checksum Considerations", IETF draft-sheinwald-iscsi-crc-02.txt.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. New technical input/ could affect implementation. Need further discussion and acceptance from STF

Cl **61** *SC* **61.2.3.1.1** *P* **241** *L* **49** # **635**

Barrass, Hugh — Cisco Systems

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

There is no mention here of the packet-based nature of the rate matching function.

It is important the assertion of the control signals Tx_Enbl and Rx_Enbl is controlled on a packet-by-packet basis.

SuggestedRemedy

Add paragraphs:

The TC shall assert Tx_Enbl when it has sufficient space for an entire (max length) frame to be transferred across the gamma interface at the net rate of the MII interface.

The TC shall assert Rx_Enbl when it has an entire frame ready to be transferred (or enough of the frame that it can guarantee that the entire frame will be ready for transfer) across the gamma interface at the net rate of the MII interface.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. New technical input/ could affect implementation. Need further discussion and acceptance from STF

Cl **61** *SC* **61.2.3.1.1** *P* **241** *L* **50** # **104**

Beck, Michael — Alcatel

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

It is stated that that the LAF shall continually assert the Tx_Avble signal. This will lead to transmission of garbage when there's no actual data to transmit.

SuggestedRemedy

The LAF shall assert Tx_Avble when it has LAF fragments to transmit, and de-assert Tx_Avble when there are no fragments to transmit. Tx_Avble must never be de-asserted during the transmission of a LAF fragment.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. New technical input/ could affect implementation. Need further discussion and acceptance from STF

Cl **61** *SC* **61.2.3.1.1** *P* **241** *L* **51** # **644**

Barrass, Hugh Cisco Systems

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

The gamma interface needs to include signals for remote access to PHY loop aggregation function registers.

The access to these registers is achieved using g.994 messaging to access the remote PMA, which then generates the signals for this particular access.

SuggestedRemedy

Add paragraph:

Additional signals are required for OAM flow (which would be relevant to referenced document section H.3.1.4). These signals allow access from the TC to the PTM entity (PCS) for reading and writing PHY loop aggregation registers. The following definitions should be tabulated:

signal: write_remote_aggregation_reg
size: 1 bit
direction: TC -> PTM entity
description: control signal to write PMD_aggregation_register. Active (min) 1 octet clock cycle.

signal: write_remote_discovery_reg
size: 1 bit
direction: TC -> PTM entity
description: control signal to write remote_discovery_register. Active (min) 1 octet clock cycle.

signal: clear_remote_discovery_reg
size: 1 bit
direction: TC -> PTM entity
description: control signal to clear remote_discovery_register. Active (min) 1 octet clock cycle.

signal: read_remote_aggregation_reg
size: 1 bit
direction: TC -> PTM entity
description: control signal to read PMD_aggregation_register. Active (min) 1 octet clock cycle.

signal: read_remote_discovery_reg
size: 1 bit
direction: TC -> PTM entity
description: control signal to read remote_discovery_register. Active (min) 1 octet clock cycle.

signal: remote_write_data_bus
size: 48 bit
direction: TC -> PTM entity
description: data bus for writing to PMD loop aggregation registers. Valid during octet clock cycle when write control is asserted.

signal: remote_read_data_bus
size: 48 bit
direction: PTM entity -> TC
description: data bus for the results of a read or atomic write function. Valid during octet clock cycle when Acknowledge_read_write or NAcknowledge_read_write is asserted.

signal: Acknowledge_read_write
size: 1 bit
direction: PTM entity -> TC
description: control signal responding (positively) to read or write. Active 1 octet clock cycle.

signal: NAcknowledge_read_write
size: 1 bit
direction: PTM entity -> TC
description: control signal responding (negatively) to read or write. Active 1 octet clock cycle.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. New technical input/ could affect implementation. Need further discussion and acceptance from STF

Cl **61** *SC* **61.2.3.1.1** *P* **241** *L* **52** # **637**

Barrass, Hugh Cisco Systems

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

Referenced document mentions OAM flow but doesn't define it.

Detailed management flow is TBD, however there should be more detail at this stage.

SuggestedRemedy

Insert paragraph:

OAM information flow across the gamma interface will support access to the registers defined in Clause 45. Refer to Clause 45 for a complete description of access to TC, PMA and PMD registers from the MDIO interface.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **61** *SC* **61.2.3.1.1** *P* **241** *L* **52** # **636**

Barrass, Hugh — Cisco Systems

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

Referenced document section H.3.1.3 does not specify what happens if the control signals (Tx_Enbl & Rx_Enbl) are de-asserted during a packet transfer.

SuggestedRemedy

Two options - we care, or we don't care:

Option 1. Insert paragraphs

The TC must keep Tx_Enbl signal asserted until the last byte of the frame is transferred across the gamma interface. If Tx_Enbl remains asserted then another frame may be transferred across the gamma interface after the inter packet gap.

The TC must keep Rx_Enbl signal asserted until the last byte of the frame is transferred across the gamma interface. If Rx_Enbl is deasserted before the end of the frame then this must be treated as a receive abort.

Option 2. Insert paragraphs

The TC may deassert Tx_Enbl at any time after the frame has started to be transferred across the gamma interface. The Tx_Enbl signal has no effect until after the end of the frame. If Tx_Enbl is asserted after the end of the frame then another frame may be transferred (preserving the minimum inter packet gap).

The TC may deassert Rx_Enbl at any time after the frame has started to be transferred across the gamma interface. The Rx_Enbl signal has no effect until after the end of the frame. If Rx_Enbl is asserted after the end of the frame then another frame may be transferred (preserving the minimum inter packet gap).

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. New technical input/ could affect implementation. Need further discussion and acceptance from STF

Cl **61** *SC* **61.2.3.1.2** *P* **242** *L* **1-3** # **207**

Zion Shohet — Infineon

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

there is a detailed description in 62.1.4.1. Need to decide what to do here.

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT. The alpha/beta interface was Acceptd be included in 62 and 63. A note will be added to 61.2.3.1.2 to refer to 62.1.4.1

Cl **61** *SC* **61.2.3.1.2** *P* **242** *L* **3** # **638**

Barrass, Hugh — Cisco Systems

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

Referenced document, section 7.1 mentions dual latency options. It should be noted that dual latency is not supported for EFM PHYs.

SuggestedRemedy

Insert paragraph:

All references to dual latency should be ignored. Dual latency is not supported by EFM PHYs.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT. Not clear if this was finally adopted by STF

Cl **61** *SC* **61.2.3.1.2** *P* **242** *L* **5** # **639**

Barrass, Hugh — Cisco Systems

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

This line states that detailed management flow information will be specified TBD.

More detail is required at this stage. I suggest that access to the local PMA/PMD is defined through Clause 45, remote access should be defined within Clause 62/63 within the OC/IB definitions.

SuggestedRemedy

Insert paragraphs:

Access to local and remote PMA and PMD parameters is defined in Clause 45. Refer to Clause 45 for mechanisms to access local and remote registers via the MDIO interface.

Refer to Clauses 62 and 63 for definitions of the g.994 messaging, Operation Channel (OC) and Indicator Bits (IB) mechanisms for accessing remote parameters.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **61** *SC* **61.2.3.1.2** *P* **242** *L* **5** # **645**

Barrass, Hugh Cisco Systems

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

The alpha/beta interface needs to include signals for remote access to PHY loop aggregation function registers.

The access to these registers is achieved using g.994 messaging to access the remote PMA, which then generates the signals for this particular access.

SuggestedRemedy

Add paragraph:

Additional signals are required for OAM flow (which would be relevant to referenced document section H.3.1.4). These signals allow access from the TC to the PTM entity (PCS) for reading and writing PHY loop aggregation registers. The following definitions should be tabulated:

signal: write_remote_aggregation_reg
size: 1 bit
direction: TC -> PTM entity
description: control signal to write PMD_aggregation_register. Active (min) 1 octet clock cycle.

signal: write_remote_discovery_reg
size: 1 bit
direction: TC -> PTM entity
description: control signal to write remote_discovery_register. Active (min) 1 octet clock cycle.

signal: clear_remote_discovery_reg
size: 1 bit
direction: TC -> PTM entity
description: control signal to clear remote_discovery_register. Active (min) 1 octet clock cycle.

signal: read_remote_aggregation_reg
size: 1 bit
direction: TC -> PTM entity
description: control signal to read PMD_aggregation_register. Active (min) 1 octet clock cycle.

signal: read_remote_discovery_reg
size: 1 bit
direction: TC -> PTM entity
description: control signal to read remote_discovery_register. Active (min) 1 octet clock cycle.

signal: remote_write_data_bus
size: 48 bit
direction: TC -> PTM entity
description: data bus for writing to PMD loop aggregation registers. Valid during octet clock cycle when write control is asserted.

signal: remote_read_data_bus
size: 48 bit
direction: PTM entity -> TC
description: data bus for the results of a read or atomic write function. Valid during octet clock cycle when Acknowledge_read_write or NAcknowledge_read_write is asserted.

signal: Acknowledge_read_write
size: 1 bit
direction: PTM entity -> TC
description: control signal responding (positively) to read or write. Active 1 octet clock cycle.

signal: NAcknowledge_read_write
size: 1 bit
direction: PTM entity -> TC
description: control signal responding (negatively) to read or write. Active 1 octet clock cycle.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. New technical input/ could affect implementation. Need further discussion at STF

Cl **61** *SC* **61.2.3.2** *P* **242** *L* **9** # **650**

Barrass, Hugh Cisco Systems

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

As per the editor's note, the encapsulation has not been decided.

The encapsulation needs to be decided ASAP.

SuggestedRemedy

See presentation on encapsulation, a detailed proposal for 64b/66b.

Remove line 9, replace with details from presentation. Referenced document section H.4.1.3 ill be retained, all other sections replaced by new proposal.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Pending presentation

Cl **61** *SC* **61.3** *P* **242** *L* # **160**

Simon, Scott — Cisco Systems, Inc.

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

The mechanisms defined in G.994 for configuring the link parameters don't mesh with the mechanisms described the copper baseline (simon_1_03_02.pdf) and in Clause 45. These need to be reconciled.

SuggestedRemedy

I have submitted a presentation (simon_1_09_02.pdf) to discuss this and other issues. The TF should review the presentation and the editors to make the appropriate changes.

Overview text similar to the following should be added: In an EFM context, G.994 shall be used only for PHY identification and NT configuration. The handshake or negotiation features of g.994 are not supported. When a port is activated, the port shall enter G.994 mode. When G.994 startup has completed, the NT port will announce itself as an EFM Cu PHY (via a CLR message) to which the LT port will respond with a similar announcement (via a CL) message (this is referred to the "C" transaction in G.994). The NT shall then initate a "B" transaction by requesting to be configured (a MR message). The LT shall respond with a MS message that contains all of the link parameters for the NT. Having acknowleged receipt of the parameters, the NT sends an ACK message and enters the configured EFM Cu mode. When the LT receives the ACK, it shall enter the configured EFM Cu mode. At this point the link initialization functions for the appropriate EFM Cu mode (see Clause 62 or Clause 63) shall begin.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. New technical input/ could affect implementation. Need further discussion and acceptance from STF

Cl **61** *SC* **61.3** *P* **250** *L* # **656**

O'Mahony, Barry — Intel Corp.

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

Additional parameters for 2BASE-TL/2PASS-TL and 10PASS-TS are needed to support aggregation discovery procedures in Clause 45.2.2.2

SuggestedRemedy

For both 2BASE-TL/2PASS-TL and 10PASS-TS define a Loop Aggregation SPAR(2) bit.

When set in a CLR message, this indicates an "aggregateable PHY". Associated with it are NPAR(3)s reporting the current value of the Loop Aggregation Discovery Register (LADR).

When set in a CLR message, this bit indicates that a modification of the LADR is requested. Associated with it are NPAR(3)s specifying the LADR value, and an NPAR(3) specified the requested action (either Set If Clear, or Clear if Same).

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. New technical input/ could affect implementation. Need further discussion and acceptance from STF

Cl **61** *SC* **61.3.8.6.2** *P* **245** *L* **54** # **208**

Zion Shohet — Infineon

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

The revision number should be determined when we finalize the EFM spec, not now.

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT. The revision number should be determined now because….

Cl **61** *SC* **61.3.9** *P* **280** *L* # **156**

Simon, Scott — Cisco Systems, Inc.

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

The reference document does not specify what happens if the next expected step in a transaction does not occur. If the link partner is disabled or reset in the middle of the transaction, the behavior of G.994 is unspecified.

SuggestedRemedy

Add a timeout to each transaction step transition such that if the expected response does not arrive from the link partner, both sides will return to the startup phase.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. New technical input/ could affect implementation. Need further discussion and acceptance from STF

Cl **61** *SC* **Figure** *P* **283** *L* **1** # **512**

Frazier, Howard — Dominet Systems

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

All figures must be editable framemaker drawings

SuggestedRemedy

Delete this figure, or redraw in framemaker

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **61** *SC* **Table** *P* **244** *L* **15** # **511**

Frazier, Howard — Dominet Systems

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

All tables must follow IEEE style manual

SuggestedRemedy

Use IEEEformat for all tables. Number tables as follows: <clause#>emdash<n+>

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **61** *SC* **Table 11** *P* **251** *L* **27** # **505**

Cook, Charles — Qwest

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

- Change "Band A" to "Band A as defined in ITU G.993.1"
- Change "Band B" to "Band B as defined in ITU G.993.1"
- Change "Band C" to "Band C as defined in ITU G.993.1"

- Add a normative note to the table that " The use of a particular band plan is subject to the regional spectral management requirement"

SuggestedRemedy

See above.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT. It is better to stay generic as new band plans may be defined, which are not available at G.993.1

Cl **61** *SC* **Table 11.30-** *P* **270** *L* # **651**

O'Mahony, Barry — Intel Corp.

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

NPAR(3)s for 2PASS-TL very numberous and lengthy

SuggestedRemedy

These could be simplified by fixing variables such as NOMPSD, MAXNOMPSD, and MAXNOMATP at their default values for G.992.3 Annex J. Upstream PSD Masks could be referenced by one of the ten mask numbers (ADLU-32 through ADLU-64) rather than the detailed list of frequency indices and log_tssi levels

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT. Editor's judgement

Cl **61A** *SC* *P* **282** *L* # **413**

Wei, Dong — SBC Communications,

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

The insertion of Annex 61A into the draft was never approved by either the Task Force (TF) or the Copper sub-TF. It is inappropriate for the editor to input anything that is not approved by the TF into the draft. This is a serious problem and it should not occur again.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete the entire clause.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT. Pending presentation and approval by STF

Cl **61A** *SC* *P* **282** *L* **1** # **441**

Vladimir Oksman — Broadcom

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

Irrelevant material

SuggestedRemedy

Exclude this clause. The material of this clause is irrelevant for the future standard. This material was never discussed and there was no agreement to include it into the draft.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT. Pending presentation and approval by STF

Cl **61A** *SC* **annex 61A** *P* **282** *L* **1** # **209**

Zion Shohet — Infineon

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

this annex should be removed. It has never been discussed, nor presented, nor agreed upon. The information within this text is not a std anywhere.
This annex should be removed.

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT. Pending presentation and approval by STF

Cl **61A** *SC* **Entire Annex** *P* **282** *L* **1** # **506**

Cook, Charles — Qwest

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

Annex 61A shall be completely removed for the following reasons:
- Annex 61A is based upon North American spectrum management requirement (draft T1.417 issue2) and may not be applicable to other regions;
- Annex A of draft T1.417 issue2, where the section "Spectral compatibility guideline" is from, provides a tool for the PSD definition in new technology development to check spectrum compatibility. And there is no need to include the partial portion of such tool in a final standard of a new technology. Additionally, there is much information needed to assure the proper use of Annex A of draft T1.417 issue2, partial quotation of draft T1.417 issue2 could potentially be misleading;
- The example in Annex 61A is irrelevant to the final IEEE 802.3ah standard and potentially misleading.

SuggestedRemedy

Completely remove Annex 61A and submit it as a contribution so that it can be deliberated by the committee. Only material that has been agreed upon should be included in drafts of the document.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT. Pending presentation and approval by STF

Cl **62** *SC* *P* *L* # **471**
Vladimir Oksman Broadcom

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

Change to a Referenced section.

SuggestedRemedy

1. Change the title to “Reference 1-2 section 6.3. Receive Functionality”
2. Replace the text of the section with word “stet”.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT. Need clarification on line number and page number

Cl **62** *SC* *P* **285** *L* **15** # **442**
Vladimir Oksman Broadcom

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

No reference to T1, ETSI and ITU standards

SuggestedRemedy

Introduce references below line 15
T1.424/Trial-use Part 2
G.993.1
TS 101 270-1
TS 101 270-2

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Need clarification

Cl **62** *SC* **4.6** *P* **318** *L* **46** # **171**
Gustafsson, Jonas Ericsson

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

Annex 61A describes spectrum compatibility according to two specific band plans (sets of PSD templates). Only one of these are defined in the subclause 62.4.6 (text and tables of PSD - frequency samples).
The existing templates are collected from the section 61 of the ANSI standard T1.417. This document does not reflect the spectrum compatibility issues outside US. Hence, severely restrict the market potential of this standard.

SuggestedRemedy

It is recommended to add text and sets of PSD templates according to European requirements. Such information can be found in section 5.1.1 of ETSI TS 101 270-2 V1.1.1.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Please provide examples

Cl **62** *SC* **62.1.2** *P* **286** *L* **14** # **105**
Beck, Michael Alcatel

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

It is stated as an objective "to provide 10 Mb/s data rate at the MII". This contradicts the objective as stated in 61.1.2 "to provide 100 Mb/s data rate at the MII".

SuggestedRemedy

Change objective into "to provide 100 Mb/s data rate at the MII".

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **62** *SC* **62.1.2** *P* **286** *L* **14, 15** # **443**
Vladimir Oksman Broadcom

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

It is not clear that full duplex operation should be with 10 Mb/s. Also, the MII in EFM application actually operates in half duplex mode.

SuggestedRemedy

Clarify the wording, with meaning “10Mb/s simultaneously in both directions”.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **62** *SC* **62.1.2** *P* **286** *L* **18** # **210**
Zion Shohet Infineon

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

"TP-2 cable" has not been determined.

SuggestedRemedy

ommit the words "TP-2"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **62** *SC* **62.1.2** *P* **286** *L* **20** # **106**
Beck, Michael Alcatel

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

Error rate is specified as a "mean ternary symbol error rate, at the PMA service interface". The PHYs proposed for 10PASS-TS do not use ternary symbols.

SuggestedRemedy

Change point c to: "To provide a communication channel with a mean bit error ratio, at the alpha/beta interface, of less than one part in 10^7 with 6 dB noise margin."

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **62** *SC* **62.1.2** *P* **286** *L* **20, 21** # **444**
Vladimir Oksman Broadcom

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

There is no definition for "mean ternary symbol error rate" and for "noise margin" in the text.

SuggestedRemedy

Either add the definition or change to "….with performance characteristics as specified in clause TBD".

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT. Same as 106

Cl **62** *SC* **62.1.4** *P* **286** *L* **27** # **445**
Vladimir Oksman Broadcom

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

The referenced figure is not valid.

SuggestedRemedy

Introduce a valid reference.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Figure 62-1

Cl **62** *SC* **62.1.4.1** *P* **286** *L* **32** # **446**
Vladimir Oksman Broadcom

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

Terms VTU-O, VTU-R are not introduced and may be actually not appropriate here.

SuggestedRemedy

Clarify definitions of the system parts and link them clearly with VDSL standards if necessary.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT. VTU-O, VTU-R are defined in the acronym section

Cl **62** *SC* **62.1.4.1.2** *P* **287** *L* **1** # **447**
Vladimir Oksman Broadcom

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

Table 62-1 doesn't include the data flow signals.

SuggestedRemedy

Add data flow signals TX_s, Rx_s to the Table.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Should be added

Cl **62** *SC* **62.1.4.1.2** *P* **287** *L* **1** # **448**
Vladimir Oksman Broadcom

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

Table 62-1 splits the text of the paragraph.

SuggestedRemedy

Move the table into inter-paragraph space.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **62** *SC* **62.1.4.1.2** *P* **287** *L* **27** # **449**
Vladimir Oksman Broadcom

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

Wrong reference, should be "Table 62-1".

SuggestedRemedy

Fix the reference.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **62** *SC* **62.1.4.2.2** *P* **288** *L* **1** # **450**
Vladimir Oksman Broadcom

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

Incomplete reference

SuggestedRemedy

Change sentence to " The data flow and synchronization flow signals ….."

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT. Sentence should not be changed because subsection is only for synchronization, and not for data-flow

Cl **62** *SC* **62.2.2** *P* **289** *L* **40** # **348**
Tom Mathey Independent

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

For the scrambler, please use a figure such as was used in Clause 49.

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Need clarification on remedy

Cl **62** *SC* **62.2.4.1** *P* **290** *L* **42, 45** # **211**
Zion Shohet Infineon

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**
define the XXXX

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Replace xxx with 62-3

Cl **62** *SC* **62.2.4.2** *P* **292** *L* **23** # **212**
Zion Shohet Infineon

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**
unclear line

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED REJECT. Need clarification at STF

Cl **62** *SC* **62.3.2** *P* **297** *L* **48** # **213**
Zion Shohet Infineon

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**
change "Figure 62-2" to "Figure 62-5"

SuggestedRemedy

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

Cl **62** *SC* **62.3.2.1** *P* **298** *L* **29** # **214**
Zion Shohet Infineon

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**
change "..Figure 62-3.." to "...Figure 62-6 .."

SuggestedRemedy

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

Cl **62** *SC* **62.3.2.1** *P* **298** *L* **52** # **451**
Vladimir Oksman Broadcom

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**
Reference "TBD"

SuggestedRemedy
1. Change "… channel as described in TBD" to "… channel."
2. Introduce a new section 62.3.2.1.1 "Reference 1-2 section 7.3.1.1. Multiplexing of VOC and eoc" with text "Stet"
3. Introduce a new section 62.3.2.1.2 "Reference 1-2 section 7.3.1.2. Demultiplexing of VOC and eoc" with text "Stet".

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

Cl **62** *SC* **62.3.2.2.2, 62.3.2.2.3, 6** *P* **299** *L* **N/A** # **455**
Vladimir Oksman Broadcom

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **D**
Performance anomalies and defects specified by IB-1 to IB-13 in Table 62-7 to 62-9 are not defined.

SuggestedRemedy
Add section with relevant definitions to the appropriate clause.

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

Cl **62** *SC* **62.3.2.2.3** *P* **299** *L* **49, 50** # **215**
Zion Shohet Infineon

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**
Change "Table x" to table "62-8".
ALso, change "the CRC_1 and CRC_2 bits shall be assigned as specified in Table 62-8", to, "CRC bits calculation is described in 62.3.2.2.5".

SuggestedRemedy

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

Cl **62** *SC* **62.3.2.2.3** *P* **299** *L* **50** # **452**
Vladimir Oksman Broadcom

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**
Confusing reference

SuggestedRemedy
Change "…in Table 68-2." to "in sub-clause 62.3.2.2.5."

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Change Table 68-2 to 62.3.2.2.5

Cl **62** *SC* **62.3.2.2.3** *P* **300** *L* **10** # **454**
Vladimir Oksman Broadcom

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**
Inconsistent specification for IB-2…IB-5.

SuggestedRemedy
Align the description for IB-2…IB-5.

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

Cl **62** *SC* **62.3.2.2.3** *P* **300** *L* **10** # **453**
Vladimir Oksman Broadcom

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **D**
There is no PCS #1 defined

SuggestedRemedy
Change "Far-end PCS #1…" to "Far-end PCS …"

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

Cl **62** *SC* **62.3.2.2.3** *P* **300** *L* **25** # **216**
Zion Shohet Infineon

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**
Add an editor note: the use of NTR is not yet finalized. Meanwhile, we reserve this bit for NTR.

SuggestedRemedy

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

Cl **62** *SC* **62.3.2.2.3** *P* **300** *L* **34** # **217**
Zion Shohet Infineon

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**
change "IIB-7" to "IB-7"

SuggestedRemedy

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

Cl **62** *SC* **62.4.3** *P* **306** *L* **51** # **107**
Beck, Michael Alcatel

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**
Reference to non-existent subclause 62.7.6.

SuggestedRemedy
Change to: "as defined in 61.3".

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

Cl **62** *SC* **62.4.4** *P* **307** *L* **20** # **218**
Zion Shohet Infineon

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**
change "PCA" to "PMA"

SuggestedRemedy

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

Cl **62** *SC* **62.4.5** *P* **307** *L* # **344**
Simon, Scott Cisco Systems, Inc.

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **D**
There is no reference to the MCM-VDSL VOC channel as defined in section 10.7. The EFM PHY will require an operations channel, so why not reference MCM-VDSL 10.7? The bitswapping function is crucial to the operation of the link.

SuggestedRemedy
Add
62.4.5.4.6 Reference section 10.7

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Need further discussion

Cl **62** *SC* **62.4.5** *P* **307** *L* **37, 38** # **219**

Zion Shohet Infineon

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

sections 13 and 14 of t1e1 are informative . we do not want now to add informative sections from other documents. we merely want to use existing std definitions. we surely can not use informative sections as normative ones in efm doc. Also, why use 8.625kHz tone spacing, while VDSL uses 4.3125kHz spacing?

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT. VDSL DMT can use n*(4.3125kHz) tone spacing and n can be any integer

Cl **62** *SC* **62.4.5.2.2** *P* **310** *L* **12** # **456**

Vladimir Oksman Broadcom

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

The values presented in Table 62-13 are relevant for North America only. That contradicts with the text in line 5 of the same page.

SuggestedRemedy

Add an explanation

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Need clarification

Cl **62** *SC* **62.4.5.6** *P* *L* # **654**

O'Mahony, Barry Intel Corp.

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

This section needs to be updated to align with G.994 section defined in Clause 61.

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Cl **62** *SC* **62.4.5.6** *P* **312** *L* **44** # **108**

Beck, Michael Alcatel

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

The information in this subclause is obsoleted by subclause 61.3.

SuggestedRemedy

Change into: "Clause 12 of MCM-VDSL is replaced with the following: The 10BASE-TS handshake procedure is based on ITU-T Recommendation G.994.1 (G.hs). It shall use the 4.3125 kHz signalling family and the duplex transmission mode. The handshake shall proceed as specified in 61.3."

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Cl **62** *SC* **62.4.6** *P* **317** *L* **46** # **508**

Frazier, Howard Dominet Systems

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

The subclauses describing SCM must be rewritten using "incorporation by reference".

SuggestedRemedy

Rewrite SCM subclauses following the style used for the MCM subclauses.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **62** *SC* **62.4.6.1.1, 62.4.6.1.2** *P* **318** *L* **3, 26** # **457**

Vladimir Oksman Broadcom

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

These sections are relevant for North America only, but presented as a generic ones.

SuggestedRemedy

Add an explanation

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **62** *SC* **62.4.6.1.2.1** *P* **319** *L* **8** # **507**

Frazier, Howard Dominet Systems

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

IEEE Style manual limits us to 5 levels of indenture, e.g. 62.4.6.1.2.

SuggestedRemedy

Renumber subclauses using limit of 5 levels of indenture.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **62** *SC* **62.5** *P* **323** *L* **38** # **459**

Vladimir Oksman Broadcom

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

Referencing to other standard bodies is not intensively used in the section.

SuggestedRemedy

Add a paragraph specifying referencing to other standard bodies with the following text.
" The presented SCM PMD functionality is specified by incorporating by reference:
- T1.424/Trial-Use standard Part 1 (Reference 1-1)
- T1.424/Trial-Use standard Part 2 (Reference 1-2)
- ITU-T G.993.1 (Reference 2)
- ETSI TS 101 270-1 (Reference 3-1)
- ETSI TS 101 270-2 (Reference 3-2)."

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **62** *SC* **62.5 2.2.1** *P* **327-334** *L* **27** # **465**

Vladimir Oksman Broadcom

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

Change to a Referenced section and fix incorrect references.

SuggestedRemedy

1. Change the title to "Modified Reference 1-2 section 6.2.2.1. Constellation encoder"
2. Replace all the text and figures of the section Pages 327-333 except Table 62-24 to the following text: "Additionally to specified in the Reference, 2-point, 512-point, and 1024-point constellations are supported. The differential encoding for 2-point constellation shall be as specified in Table 62-24. The constellation diagram for 512-point is given in Figure 62-25."
3. After replacement follow the text from line 1 Page 334.
4. Change "Table 3" in line 41 of Page 334 to "Table 62-26"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT. Addition to reference need to be discussed at STF

Cl **62** *SC* **62.5.1.1** *P* **323** *L* **46, 51** # **458**

Vladimir Oksman Broadcom

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

Missing reference ("TBD")

SuggestedRemedy

Add reference 62.5.4 in line 47 and remove "…(see section TBD)" from line 51 since the reference is the next sub-clause.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT. Same comment as 460

Cl **62** *SC* **62.5.1.1** *P* **323** *L* **46, 51** # **460**

Vladimir Oksman Broadcom

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

Missing reference ("TBD")

SuggestedRemedy

Add reference 62.5.4 in line 47 and remove "…(see section TBD)" from line 51 since the reference is the next sub-clause.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **62** *SC* **62.5.1.2** *P* **324** *L* **30-38** # **462**

Vladimir Oksman Broadcom

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

Change to a Referenced section

SuggestedRemedy

Change the title to "Reference 1-2 section 6.1.3. Timing " and replace the taxt with "Stet"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **62** *SC* **62.5.1.2** *P* **324** *L* **35** # **461**

Vladimir Oksman Broadcom

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

Missing reference ("TBD")

SuggestedRemedy

Change the last sentence of the paragraph to " … frequencies are regionally specific. The currently standardized values are specified in Reference 2, section 6.1 and Annexes A, B, C. "

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Cl **62** *SC* **62.5.2.1** *P* **325** *L* **3, 10-22** # **463**

Vladimir Oksman Broadcom

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

Change to a Referenced section and fix the missing and incorrect references.

SuggestedRemedy

1. Change the title to "Modified Reference 1-2 section 6.2.1. Splitter".
2. Change "section TBD" in line 10 to "sub-clause 62.3.2.2".
3. Change "Figure 2" in lines 14,15,22 to "Figure 62-15".

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Need clarification

Cl **62** *SC* **62.5.2.2** *P* **327** *L* **1, 3, 5** # **464**

Vladimir Oksman Broadcom

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

Change to a Referenced section and fix incorrect references.

SuggestedRemedy

1. Change the title to “Modified Reference 1-2 section 6.2.2. Coding and Modulation”.
2. Change “EFM-O, EFM-R” in line 3 to “VTU-O, VTU-R”, respectively.
3. Change “Figure 62-13” to “Figure 62-16” in line 10.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Need clarification

Cl **62** *SC* **62.5.2.2.1** *P* **327** *L* **29-43** # **220**

Zion Shohet Infineon

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

references to figures and tables are incorrect.

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Cl **62** *SC* **62.5.2.2.1** *P* **328** *L* **28** # **221**

Zion Shohet Infineon

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

in table 62-24, in the 2 right columns, change "previuos" to "current"

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Cl **62** *SC* **62.5.2.2.2** *P* **334** *L* **48** # **466**

Vladimir Oksman Broadcom

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

Change to a Referenced section.

SuggestedRemedy

1. Change the title to “Modified Reference 1-2 section 6.2.2.2. Modulator”
2. Replace the text of the section with: “The amplitudes In and Qn components shall maintain the relative values of 1, 3, 5, … 31 as depicted in the constellation diagram in Figure 62-25 and in Table 62-26, with a tolerance of +/-0.06 relative to these values.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

Need further discussion

Cl **62** *SC* **62.5.2.2.4** *P* **338** *L* **14** # **470**

Vladimir Oksman Broadcom

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

Change to a Referenced section.

SuggestedRemedy

1. Change the title to “Reference 1-2 section 6.5.1.3. Spectral allocation of the transmit signal”
2. Replace the text of the section with word “stet”.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **62** *SC* **62.5.4** *P* **338** *L* **42-44** # **472**

Vladimir Oksman Broadcom

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

Incorrect reference

SuggestedRemedy

1. Change “Figure 1” in line 42 to “Figure 62-14”
2. Change “section TBD” in line 44 to “Reference 1-1 section 5”.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **62** *SC* **62.5.4.1.1** *P* **339** *L* **2-5** # **473**
Vladimir Oksman Broadcom

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

Incomplete specification (TBD)

SuggestedRemedy

1. Change the first sentence to "….comply with the set PSD templates and the wideband power limitation as specified in section TBD." to "….comply with the regionally specific PSD templates and the wideband power limitation. The standardized values are specified in Reference 1-1 section 7.1, and Reference 3-1 section 8.2.5.2.1."
2. Change "section TBD in line 5 to "sub-clause 62.5.8.2.1.2"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

Need further discussion

Cl **62** *SC* **62.5.4.1.3** *P* **339** *L* **14** # **474**
Vladimir Oksman Broadcom

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

Change to a Referenced section.

SuggestedRemedy

3. Change the title to "Reference 1-2 section 6.4.2.1.2. Egress control"
4. Replace the text of the section with word "stet".

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Cl **62** *SC* **62.5.4.2** *P* **341** *L* **37, 41, 45** # **478**
Vladimir Oksman Broadcom

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

Incorrect references and titles.

SuggestedRemedy

1. Change "Table 5" in line 38 to "Table 62-28"
2. Change "Figure 12" in line 45 to "Figure 62-26"
3. Move Table 62-29 from Page 342 under the title 62-28
4. Remove the wrong title 62-29

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **62** *SC* **62.5.4.2** *P* **341** *L* **41** # **226**
Zion Shohet Infineon

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

no table

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.Will supply a table

Cl **62** *SC* **62.5.4.2** *P* **342** *L* **1** # **227**
Zion Shohet Infineon

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

table title is wrong. should be "out of band PSD masks".

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **62** *SC* **62.5.4.2** *P* **342** *L* **24, 25** # **228**
Zion Shohet Infineon

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

equation overlaps the text.

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **62** *SC* **62.5.4.2.2.1** *P* **335** *L* **23** # **467**
Vladimir Oksman Broadcom

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

Change to a Referenced section.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the title to "Modified Reference 1-2 section 6.2.2.2.1. Symbol rates and carrier frequencies"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **62** *SC* **62.5.4.2.2.1** *P* **335** *L* **42** # **222**

Zion Shohet Infineon

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

delete item 2 "some values .... section tbd"

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **62** *SC* **62.5.4.2.2.2** *P* **336** *L* **1, 15** # **468**

Vladimir Oksman Broadcom

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

Incorrect references

SuggestedRemedy

1. Change “Figure 3” in Line 1 to “Figure 62-16”
2. Change “Table 4” in Line 15 to “Table 62-27”

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **62** *SC* **62.5.4.2.2.2** *P* **337** *L* **39, 42** # **469**

Vladimir Oksman Broadcom

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

Missing references

SuggestedRemedy

1. Change “Figure 3” in Line 39 to “Figure 62-16”
2. Change “section TBD” in Line 42 to “sub-clause 62.5.4.2”

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **62** *SC* **62.5.4.3** *P* **342** *L* **24** # **479**

Vladimir Oksman Broadcom

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

Formula overlaps the text.

SuggestedRemedy

Fix the format of the formula

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **62** *SC* **62.5.5** *P* **342** *L* **46** # **480**

Vladimir Oksman Broadcom

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

Change the following sections to Referenced.

SuggestedRemedy

Add a sentence: “ In the referenced sections the OOC is referred as VDSL Overhead Control (VOC) channel”

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Need updated material or presentation to discuss and then agree

Cl **62** *SC* **62.5.5.1** *P* **343** *L* **1** # **481**

Vladimir Oksman Broadcom

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

Change to a Referenced section.

SuggestedRemedy

1. Change the title to “Reference 1-2 section 8.1.1. VOC messages”
2. Replace the text of the section with word “stet”.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Need updated material or presentation to discuss and then agree

Cl **62** *SC* **62.5.5.2** *P* **343** *L* **14** # **482**

Vladimir Oksman Broadcom

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

Change to a Referenced section.

SuggestedRemedy

1. Change the title to “Reference 1-2 section 8.1.2. VOC message transport”
2. Replace the text of the section with word “stet”.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Need updated material or presentation to discuss and then agree

Cl **62** *SC* **62.5.5.2.1** *P* **343** *L* **19** # **483**

Vladimir Oksman Broadcom

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

Change to a Referenced section.

SuggestedRemedy

1. Change the title to "Reference 1-2 section 8.1.2.1. VOC handshake"
2. Replace the text of the section with word "stet".

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Need updated material or presentation to discuss and then agree

Cl **62** *SC* **62.5.5.2.2** *P* **344** *L* **19** # **484**

Vladimir Oksman Broadcom

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

Change to a Referenced section.

SuggestedRemedy

1. Change the title to "Reference 1-2 section 8.1.2.2. VOC handshake"
2. Replace the text of the section with word "stet".

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Need updated material or presentation to discuss and then agree

Cl **62** *SC* **62.5.5.2.2** *P* **344** *L* **34** # **485**

Vladimir Oksman Broadcom

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

Change to a Referenced section.

SuggestedRemedy

1. Change the title to "Reference 1-2 section 8.1.2.2. VOC handshake flow charts"
2. Replace the text of the section with word "stet".

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Need updated material or presentation to discuss and then agree

Cl **62** *SC* **62.5.5.2.3** *P* **346** *L* **33** # **486**

Vladimir Oksman Broadcom

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

Change to a Referenced section.

SuggestedRemedy

1. Change the title to "Reference 1-2 section 8.1.2.3. Multiple words communication"
2. Replace the text of the section with word "stet".

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Need updated material or presentation to discuss and then agree

Cl **62** *SC* **62.5.5.3** *P* **346** *L* **46** # **487**

Vladimir Oksman Broadcom

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

Change to a Referenced section.

SuggestedRemedy

1. Change the title to "Reference 1-2 section 8.1.3. VOC message set"
2. Replace the text of the section with word "stet".

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Need updated material or presentation to discuss and then agree

Cl **62** *SC* **62.5.5.3.1** *P* **347** *L* **7** # **488**

Vladimir Oksman Broadcom

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

Change to a Referenced section.

SuggestedRemedy

1. Change the title to "Reference 1-2 section 8.1.3.1. Status messages"
2. Replace the text of the section with word "stet".

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Need updated material or presentation to discuss and then agree

Cl **62** *SC* **62.5.5.3.2** *P* **347** *L* **38** # **489**

Vladimir Oksman Broadcom

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

Change to a Referenced section.

SuggestedRemedy

1. Change the title to “Reference 1-2 section 8.1.3.2. Performance monitoring messages”
2. Replace the text of the section with word “stet”.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Need updated material or presentation to discuss and then agree

Cl **62** *SC* **62.5.5.3.2** *P* **348** *L* **26** # **230**

Zion Shohet Infineon

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

wrong reference to tables 12-14

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Need updated material or presentation to discuss and then agree

Cl **62** *SC* **62.5.5.3.2** *P* **348** *L* **4** # **229**

Zion Shohet Infineon

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

inset here table 62-31

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Need updated material or presentation to discuss and then agree

Cl **62** *SC* **62.5.5.3.3** *P* **348** *L* **28** # **490**

Vladimir Oksman Broadcom

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

Change to a Referenced section.

SuggestedRemedy

1. Change the title to “Reference 1-2 section 8.1.3.3. Configuration messages”
2. Replace the text of the section with word “stet”.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Need updated material or presentation to discuss and then agree

Cl **62** *SC* **62.5.5.3.4** *P* **354** *L* **1** # **493**

Vladimir Oksman Broadcom

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

Change to a Referenced section.

SuggestedRemedy

1. Change the title to “Reference 1-2 section 8.1.3.4. Control messages”
2. Replace the text of the section with word “stet”.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Need updated material or presentation to discuss and then agree

Cl **62** *SC* **62.5.5.3.4** *P* **354** *L* **7** # **232**

Zion Shohet Infineon

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

insert table 62-37 here.

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Need updated material or presentation to discuss and then agree

Cl **62** *SC* **62.5.6.1** *P* **357** *L* **3** # **233**
Zion Shohet Infineon

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**
change "table 62-31" to "figure 62-31"

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Need updated material or presentation to discuss and then agree

Cl **62** *SC* **62.5.6.1** *P* **357-358** *L* **1** # **494**
Vladimir Oksman Broadcom

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**
Change to a Referenced section.

SuggestedRemedy
Change the title to “Reference 1-2 section 9.1. Link state and timing diagram”

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Need updated material or presentation to discuss and then agree

Cl **62** *SC* **62.5.6.1.4.1** *P* **339** *L* **31, 33, 48** # **475**
Vladimir Oksman Broadcom

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**
Change to a Referenced section.

SuggestedRemedy
1. Change the title to “Modified Reference 1-2 section 6.4.2.1.3.1. Start-up power back-off”
2. Change “TBD” in line 33 to “sub-clause 62.5.8.2.1.2”
3. Change “…regionally specific and should be as specified in section TBD” in line 48 to “… regionally specific. The standardized values are specified in Reference 1-1 section 71.3.1.1, and Reference 3-1 section 8.2.7.1”

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Need updated material or presentation to discuss and then agree

Cl **62** *SC* **62.5.6.1.4.1** *P* **339** *L* **39, 42** # **223**
Zion Shohet Infineon

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**
the functions are confusing. rephrase them clearly.

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Need updated material or presentation to discuss and then agree

Cl **62** *SC* **62.5.6.1.4.1** *P* **339** *L* **53** # **224**
Zion Shohet Infineon

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**
add "see note 1" after the last sentence ".... of the loop".

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Need updated material or presentation to discuss and then agree

Cl **62** *SC* **62.5.6.1.4.1** *P* **340** *L* **1, 4, 9, 1** # **476**
Vladimir Oksman Broadcom

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**
Missing references and TBDs.

SuggestedRemedy
1. Change “TBD” in line 1 to “0.0018*sqrt(fc)”
2. Change “section TBD” in line 4 to “sub-clause 62.5.4.1.1”
3. Change “Table TBD” in line 9 to “section 62.5.8.2.1.2”
4. Change “…comply with Reference 3-1 section 8.2.7.1”

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Need updated material or presentation to discuss and then agree

Cl **62** *SC* **62.5.6.1.4.2** *P* **340** *L* **16** # **477**

Vladimir Oksman Broadcom

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

Change to a Referenced section.

SuggestedRemedy

1. Change the title to “Modified Reference 1-2 section 6.4.2.1.3.2. Steady-state PSD shaping”

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Need updated material or presentation to discuss and then agree

Cl **62** *SC* **62.5.6.1.4.2** *P* **340** *L* **30, 32** # **225**

Zion Shohet Infineon

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

the functions are confusing. Rephrase them clearly.

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Need updated material or presentation to discuss and then agree

Cl **62** *SC* **62.5.6.2** *P* **359** *L* **16** # **495**

Vladimir Oksman Broadcom

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

Change to a Referenced section.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the title to “Reference 1-2 section 9.2. Link transmission parameters”

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Need updated material or presentation to discuss and then agree

Cl **62** *SC* **62.5.6.2.1** *P* **359** *L* **18** # **496**

Vladimir Oksman Broadcom

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

Change to a Referenced section.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the title to “Reference 1-2 section 9.2.1. Set of transmission parameters”

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Need updated material or presentation to discuss and then agree

Cl **62** *SC* **62.5.6.2.2** *P* **360** *L* **49** # **497**

Vladimir Oksman Broadcom

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

Change to a Referenced section.

SuggestedRemedy

1. Change the title to “Reference 1-2 section 9.2.2. Transmission parameters modification”
2. Change the text of this section and subsections to “stet”

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Need updated material or presentation to discuss and then agree

Cl **62** *SC* **62.5.6.3.1** *P* **363** *L* **6** # **498**

Vladimir Oksman Broadcom

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

Change to a Referenced section.

SuggestedRemedy

1. Change the title to “Reference 1-2 section 9.3.1. Functional diagram”
2. Change the text of this section and subsections to “stet”

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Need updated material or presentation to discuss and then agree

Cl **62** *SC* **62.5.6.3.2** *P* **363** *L* **50** # **499**

Vladimir Oksman Broadcom

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

Change to a Referenced section.

SuggestedRemedy

1. Change the title to “Reference 1-2 section 9.3.2. Control signals”
2. Change the text of this section and subsections to “stet”

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Need updated material or presentation to discuss and then agree

Cl **62** *SC* **62.5.6.3.3** *P* **364** *L* **24** # **500**

Vladimir Oksman Broadcom

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

Change to a Referenced section.

SuggestedRemedy

1. Change the title to “Reference 1-2 section 9.3.3. Flags and indicators”
2. Change the text of this section and subsections to “stet”

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Need updated material or presentation to discuss and then agree

Cl **62** *SC* **62.5.6.3.4** *P* **364** *L* **43** # **501**

Vladimir Oksman Broadcom

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

Change to a Referenced section.

SuggestedRemedy

1. Change the title to “Reference 1-2 section 9.3.4. Transmit signals and timers”
2. Change the text of this section and subsections to “stet”

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Need updated material or presentation to discuss and then agree

Cl **62** *SC* **62.5.6.4** *P* **365** *L* **50** # **502**

Vladimir Oksman Broadcom

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

Change to a Referenced section.

SuggestedRemedy

1. Change the title to “Reference 1-2 section 9.3.5. VTU-O state machine”
2. Change the text of this section and subsections to “stet”

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Need updated material or presentation to discuss and then agree

Cl **62** *SC* **62.5.6.4** *P* **366** *L* **39, 43** # **234**

Zion Shohet Infineon

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

change "figure 17" to "figure 62-31"

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Need updated material or presentation to discuss and then agree

Cl **62** *SC* **62.5.6.5** *P* **370** *L* **1** # **503**

Vladimir Oksman Broadcom

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

Change to a Referenced section.

SuggestedRemedy

1. Change the title to “Reference 1-2 section 9.3.6. VTU-R state machine”
2. Change the text of this section and subsections to “stet”

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Need updated material or presentation to discuss and then agree

Cl **62** *SC* **62.5.6.6** *P* **373** *L* **20** # **504**

Vladimir Oksman Broadcom

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

Change to a Referenced section.

SuggestedRemedy

1. Change the title to “Reference 1-2 section 9.3.7. Two-step activation”
2. Change the text of this section and subsections to “stet”

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Need updated material or presentation to discuss and then agree

Cl **62** *SC* **62.5.6.6** *P* **373** *L* **27, 29, 30** # **235**
Zion Shohet Infineon

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**
incorrect references.

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Need updated material or presentation to discuss and then agree

Cl **62** *SC* **62.5.7.3.3.1** *P* **348** *L* **36** # **491**
Vladimir Oksman Broadcom

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**
Change to a Referenced section.

SuggestedRemedy
1. Change the title to “Reference 1-2 section 8.1.3.3.1. Parameter setting messages”
2. Replace the text of the section with word “stet”.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Need updated material or presentation to discuss and then agree

Cl **62** *SC* **62.5.7.3.3.1** *P* **353** *L* **3,4** # **231**
Zion Shohet Infineon

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**
note 2 is not relevant. delete it.

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Need updated material or presentation to discuss and then agree

Cl **62** *SC* **62.5.7.3.3.2** *P* **353** *L* **33** # **492**
Vladimir Oksman Broadcom

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**
Change to a Referenced section.

SuggestedRemedy
1. Change the title to “Reference 1-2 section 8.1.3.3.2. Trigger messages”
2. Replace the text of the section with word “stet”.

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

Cl **62** *SC* **Figure 62-33** *P* **367** *L* **10** # **100**
Turner, Ed Lattice Semiconductor

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **D**
State diagram is not in 802.3 standard format.

SuggestedRemedy
Convert to 802.3 standard format.

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

Cl **62** *SC* **Figure 62-13** *P* **312** *L* **7** # **98**
Turner, Ed Lattice Semiconductor

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **D**
State diagram is not in 802.3 standard format.

SuggestedRemedy
Convert to 802.3 standard format.

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

Cl **62** *SC* **Figure 62-31** *P* **357** *L* **10** # **99**
Turner, Ed Lattice Semiconductor

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **D**
State diagram is not in 802.3 standard format.

SuggestedRemedy
Convert to 802.3 standard format.

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

Cl **62** *SC* **Figure 62-35** *P* **370** *L* **23** # **101**
Turner, Ed Lattice Semiconductor

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **D**
State diagram is not in 802.3 standard format.

SuggestedRemedy
Convert to 802.3 standard format.

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

Cl **62** *SC* **Figure 62-8** *P* **301** *L* **34** # **97**

Turner, Ed — Lattice Semiconductor

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

State diagram is not in 802.3 standard format.

SuggestedRemedy

Convert to 802.3 standard format.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **63** *SC* *P* *L* # **159**

Simon, Scott — Cisco Systems, Inc.

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

Since Ethernet MACs send “frames” and the Copper PMAs also send “frames” that transport the “Ethernet frames” we have a nomenclature name space ambiguity.

SuggestedRemedy

I think we need to decide on a better terminology. Perhaps refer to the “PMA frames” as “blocks,” “parcels,” “clumps,” “lumps,” "bales," or anything else TBD by the TF. Too bad "packet is taken".

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Need further discussion

Cl **63** *SC* **63.1** *P* **376** *L* # **416**

Wei, Dong — SBC Communications,

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

The PHY described in this subcluase is based on ADSL2 (G.992.3) Annex J. Since Annex J was developed primarily for some European countries where ADSL-over-ISDN is the dominant ADSL variant, G.992.3 does not specify the performance requirements of Annex J for North America. Therefore, Annex J is not suitable for deployment in the U.S. As a future ANSI standard, the P802.3ah draft should not adopt this PHY.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete the entire subclause (from Page 376 to Page 541).

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT. At Vancouver meeting, the chair of ITU Study Group 15, Question 4 stated that Annex J is suitable to any geographical region as long as it meets the appropriate spectral guidelines

Cl **63** *SC* **63.1** *P* **376** *L* # **415**

Wei, Dong — SBC Communications,

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

2BASE-TL is a much better PHY for the long-reach objective than 2PASS-TL due to the following reasons:
1) 2BASE-TL has a significantly better simulated rate/reach performance than 2PASS-TL for most noise models that are commonly used;
2) Lab/field testing and deployment have shown that the real-world performance of 2BASE-TL-type technologies (e.g., SHDSL, HDSL2/4) is very close to their simulated performance, and that of 2PASS-TL-type technologies (e.g., ADSL) is significantly below their simulated performance.
3) 2BASE-TL is a basis system in T1.417 and hence its deployment in the public access network is protected. 2PASS-TL does not have this advantage.
4) 2BASE-TL is a mature and proven technology, and 2PASS-TL is new and untested.
5) 2BASE-TL supports repeater mode, which is a common requirement for business applications. 2PASS-TL does not support repeater mode. Therefore, 2BASE-TL can be deployed on long loops and hence can achieve much broader market potential than 2PASS-TL.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete the entire subclause (from Page 376 to Page 541).

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT. It appears to be a personal opinion

Cl **63** *SC* **63.1** *P* **376** *L* # **414**

Wei, Dong — SBC Communications,

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

The PHY described in this subcluase is based on ADSL2 (G.992.3). ADSL2 is not a standardized technology in the U.S. In fact, any standardized DSL technology in the U.S. must be based on an ANSI standard. There does not exist any ANSI standard on which ADSL2 is based. As a future ANSI standard, the P802.3ah draft should not adopt any non-standardized DSL technology in the U.S.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete the entire subclause (from Page 376 to Page 541).

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT. IEEE standards are expected to have international applications

Cl **63** *SC* **63.1** *P* **376** *L* **1** # **510**

Frazier, Howard — Dominet Systems

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

The subclauses describing 2PASS-TL must be rewritten using "incorporation by reference".

SuggestedRemedy

Rewrite 2PASS-TL subclauses following the style used for the 2BASE-TL subclauses.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **63** *SC* **63.1.1.4.2** *P* **379** *L* **23** # **170**

Gustafsson, Jonas — Ericsson

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

ADSL2 Annex J, defined by ITU-T SG15/Q4 describes the operation and allowed PSD masks allowing increased number of upstream subcarriers to be used. However, ADSL2 Annex J is allowed to operate both with overlapped and non-overlaped spectrum. An annex of the ETSI ADSL technical specification, ETSI TS 101 388 V1.3.1 Annex E, describes a similar mode of operation.
This is not what is stated in this subclause.

SuggestedRemedy

It is suggested to remove the text on Line 2-3 on page 379 and replace it with the following text: "The PMD default mode of operation uses non-overlapped spectrum. Hence upstream and downstream subcarriers does not overlap. In addition it may optionally operate using overlapped spectrum. Hence upstream and downstream subcarriers overlap. PSD templates for overlapped and non-overlapped mode are described in subclause TBD".

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **63** *SC* **63.1.2** *P* **376** *L* **47** # **109**

Beck, Michael — Alcatel

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

It is stated as an objective to "Provide a minimum full duplex data rate service of 2 Mbps at the MII". This contradicts the objective as stated in 61.1.2 "to provide 100 Mb/s data rate at the MII".

SuggestedRemedy

Change objective into: "To provide 100 Mb/s data rate at the MII and a minimum of 2 Mb/s at the alpha/beta-interface".

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **63** *SC* **63.2** *P* **542** *L* **10** # **400**

Jackson, Stephen — Hatteras Networks

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

"the copper networks"

SuggestedRemedy

needs claification, maybe say "public loop plants" like in the preceding paragraph

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Need updated material or presentation to discuss and then agree

Cl **63** *SC* **63.2** *P* **542** *L* **56** # **423**

Artman, Doug — Texas Instruments

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

The sentence beginning with "The copper category" is confusing. I'm not sure what is trying to be said there. Is the intent to inform the reader that the type of coppers pairs over which this service is intended identical to those being used in the access network?

SuggestedRemedy

These copper pairs are identical to those currently used in the access network according to ANSI, ETSI and ITU-T standards.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Need updated material or presentation to discuss and then agree

Cl **63** *SC* **63.2.2** *P* **542** *L* **2330** # **172**

Gustafsson, Jonas — Ericsson

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

The objective in this subclause is no equal to the ones described for 2Pass-TL.

SuggestedRemedy

Syncronize with objectives stated in subclause 63.1.1.2

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Need updated material or presentation to discuss and then agree

Cl **63** *SC* **63.2.2** *P* **542** *L* **28** # **426**

Artman, Doug Texas Instruments

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

The word operating is misspelled.

SuggestedRemedy

correct spelling

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **63** *SC* **63.2.2** *P* **542** *L* **30** # **424**

Artman, Doug Texas Instruments

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

The objective under f) doesn't really belong here. Bonding for long reach is being addressed in another clause and this clause should focus on the objectives for the PHY only.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove item f)

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Need updated material or presentation to discuss and then agree

Cl **63** *SC* **63.2.2 (e)** *P* **542** *L* **29** # **401**

Jackson, Stephen Hatteras Networks

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

figure "6" should be "5"

SuggestedRemedy

change to "5"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **63** *SC* **63.2.3** *P* **542** *L* **36** # **425**

Artman, Doug Texas Instruments

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

The following statement should be removed: "When the above specification is superseded by an approved revision, the revision shall apply." We should be referencing a single standard here, and not leaving the door wide open to any other follow-on standards that may come later. I believe 802.3 should create a definitive standard and reference a specific standard if it exists, but not set itself up to have its standards implicity modified by others.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove this sentence.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Need updated material or presentation to discuss and then agree

Cl **63** *SC* **63.2.4.1.1** *P* **543** *L* **4** # **427**

Artman, Doug Texas Instruments

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

The acronyms STU-C and STU-R are not defined previously.

SuggestedRemedy

Editor should appropriately define these acronyms or use more generic terms.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Need updated material or presentation to discuss and then agree

Cl **63** *SC* **63.2.4.1.3** *P* **543** *L* **23** # **428**

Artman, Doug Texas Instruments

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

The acronym OC-TC is not defined or referenced in Figure 63-2.

SuggestedRemedy

Editor should appropriately define this entity.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Need updated material or presentation to discuss and then agree

Cl **63** *SC* **63.2.4.2** *P* **543** *L* **41** # **404**

Jackson, Stephen Hatteras Networks

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

Data mode may use any of several levels of TC.

SuggestedRemedy

Strike last sentence in (c)

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Need updated material or presentation to discuss and then agree

Cl **63** *SC* **63.2.4.2** *P* **543** *L* **43** # **402**

Jackson, Stephen Hatteras Networks

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

Since IEEE is creating its own bonding (loop aggregation) spec, the G991.2 PMD 4-wire mode is not relevant to this standard.

SuggestedRemedy

Strike sentence.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Need updated material or presentation to discuss and then agree

Cl **63** *SC* **63.2.4.2** *P* **543** *L* **4344** # **429**

Artman, Doug Texas Instruments

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

The statement "The PMD allows the optional use of a 4-wire mode and of repeaters to increase the reach or capacity of a copper link" should be modified to take out the 4-wire mode part. This feature should be adequately described in the bonding clause.

SuggestedRemedy

Change sentence to "The PMD allows the optional use of repeaters to increase the reach of a copper link."

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Need updated material or presentation to discuss and then agree

Cl **63** *SC* **63.3.1.2** *P* **544** *L* **32** # **405**

Jackson, Stephen Hatteras Networks

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

isn't the correct formula:

2(n*64 + i*8) kbps

?

SuggestedRemedy

verify

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Will look into it

Cl **63** *SC* **63.3.1.2** *P* **544** *L* **3238** # **430**

Artman, Doug Texas Instruments

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

The agreement reach in 802.3ah was to reference G.shdsl as one of the potential long reach PHYs. This text is referring to "Enhanced SHDSL" or G.shdsl.bis which is a potential standard currently being discussed in other standards bodies. Although there are agreements in ITU-T to support higher data rates in G.shdsl.bis, there are no agreements on how this is to be accomplished. We should keep our reference to what was agreed to in EFM, G.shdsl, and potentially consider later revisions of G.shdsl in a subsequent revision of the EFM standard.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the value of 81 and reference to subclause editor's note in lines 32 and 33, and remove the subclause editor's note in lines 34-38.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **63** *SC* **63.3.1.3** *P* **544** *L* **47** # **431**

Artman, Doug Texas Instruments

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

There is a reference to a non-existent section (63.2.1.2)

SuggestedRemedy

Subclause editor should clarify the reference and what is intended.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Need updated material or presentation to discuss and then agree

Cl **63** *SC* **63.3.1.3** *P* **544** *L* **48** # **406**

Jackson, Stephen Hatteras Networks

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

4 wire mode is out-of-scope due to the 802.3ah bonding mechanism

SuggestedRemedy

strike comments

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Need updated material or presentation to discuss and then agree

Cl **63** *SC* **63.3.1.3** *P* **544** *L* **4853** # **432**

Artman, Doug Texas Instruments

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

This section should be removed as it refers to bonding which is covered in another clause.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove this section.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Need updated material or presentation to discuss and then agree

Cl **63** *SC* **63.3.14.4.1.2** *P* **491** *L* **29** # **509**

Frazier, Howard Dominet Systems

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

IEEE Style manual limits us to 5 levels of indenture, e.g. 63.3.14.4.1

SuggestedRemedy

Renumber subclauses using limit of 5 levels of indenture.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **63** *SC* **63.4.1.2** *P* **547548** *L* **52541** # **433**

Artman, Doug Texas Instruments

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

There are no agreements yet within ITU-T as to how to create an G.shdsl.bis, and we should remove all references to this. Previous agreements in 802.3ah were limited to G.shdsl.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove this note.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **63** *SC* **63.4.1.3.3** *P* **548** *L* **2122** # **434**

Artman, Doug Texas Instruments

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

This note refers to a standard which does not yet exist and has no substantial technical agreements yet. We should remove this note and keep our references to G.shdsl.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove this note.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **63** *SC* **63.4.8.1** *P* **553** *L* **1719** # **435**

Artman, Doug Texas Instruments

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

There have been no agreements within 802.3ah to include an enhanced version of SHDSL, and discussion in ITU-T has not yet reached the point where agreements on expanding the bandwidth of SHDSL have been made. We should remove this note and keep our references to G.shdsl (as agreed earlier).

SuggestedRemedy

Remove this note.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **63** *SC* **Table 63-1** *P* **547** *L* **42** # **403**

Jackson, Stephen Hatteras Networks

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

T1E1.4 has acted to approve 32 TC-PAM and to study 64 and 128 TC-PAM; letter to this effect sent to ITU-T SG14/Q4.

SuggestedRemedy

Add necessary data to this chart to reference expanded constellations.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Once ITU-T or T1E1.4 add higher order constellation to SHDSL, then will not see any problem accepting the comment