## omments

			1 002.0011 Dit	aft 1.1a Co
C 63 S 63.1	P 376	L	# 99018	C 63
Wei, Dong	SBC Comn	nunication		Wei, Dong
Comment Type TR	Comment Status D		D1.0 #415	Comment
following reasons: 1) 2BASE-TL has a s for most noise model 2) Lab/field testing an 2BASE-TL-type techn performance, and that their simulated perfor 3) 2BASE-TL is a bas network is protected. 4) 2BASE-TL is a ma 5) 2BASE-TL suppor	sis system in T1.417 and he 2PASS-TL does not have th ture and proven technology, ts repeater mode, which is a	rate/reach perf hat the real-wo L2/4) is very cl ogies (e.g., AD nce its deployn nis advantage. and 2PASS-T common requ	formance than 2PASS-TL orld performance of ose to their simulated ISL) is significantly below nent in the public access L is new and untested. irement for business	The F J was domir J for I future Suggeste Delete Proposed COM
	TL does not support repeate ps and hence can achieve m			Cover
2PASS-TL.	ps and hence can achieve h			C 63 WEI, DON
SuggestedRemedy	clause (from Page 376 to Pa	aa 541)		Comment
		ige 541).		This c
	Response Status W DLVED his would require a vote in th id adopt only one PHY to me			2BAS follow 1) 2B for mo
Those in favor of reje Yes: 15 No: 8				2) Lat 2BAS perfor their s
C 63 S 63.1	P 376	L	# 99017	3) 2B/ netwo
Wei, Dong	SBC Comn	nunication		4) 2B
Comment Type TR	Comment Status D		D1.0 #414	5) 2B/ applic
	n this subcluase is based on			deplo
must be based on an ADSL2 is based. As	ogy in the U.S. In fact, any s ANSI standard. There does a future ANSI standard, the	not exist any A	ANSI standard on which	2PAS Suggeste
standardized DSL tee	chnology in the U.S.			Delete
SuggestedRemedy				Proposed
Delete the entire sub	clause (from Page 376 to Pa	age 541).		COMI Cover
Proposed Response COMMENT UNRESC	Response Status W			2310

Covered by response to 99018

C 63	S	63.1	P 376	L	#	<u>99019</u>	
Wei, Dong			SBC Commu	unication			

nt Type TR Comment Status D

PHY described in this subcluase is based on ADSL2 (G.992.3) Annex J. Since Annex is developed primarily for some European countries where ADSL-over-ISDN is the inant ADSL variant, G.992.3 does not specify the performance requirements of Annex North America. Therefore, Annex J is not suitable for deployment in the U.S. As a e ANSI standard, the P802.3ah draft should not adopt this PHY.

#### edRemedy

te the entire subclause (from Page 376 to Page 541).

d Response Response Status W MENT UNRESOLVED

ered by response to 99018

C 63	s	63.1	P 3	83	L 1	#	99117
WEI, DONG			SBC	Comm	unication		
Comment Typ	be	TR	Comment Status	D			D1.1 #638

comment is the same as Comment #415 on Draft 1.0.

SE-TL is a much better PHY for the long-reach objective than 2PASS-TL due to the wing reasons:

BASE-TL has a significantly better simulated rate/reach performance than 2PASS-TL nost noise models that are commonly used;

ab/field testing and deployment have shown that the real-world performance of SE-TL type technologies (e.g., SHDSL, HDSL2/4) is very close to their simulated prmance, and that of 2PASS-TL-type technologies (e.g., ADSL) is significantly below simulated performance.

BASE-TL is a basis system in T1.417 and hence its deployment in the public access ork is protected. 2PASS-TL does not have this advantage.

BASE-TL is a mature and proven technology, and 2PASS-TL is new and untested. BASE-TL supports repeater mode, which is a common requirement for business ications. 2PASS-TL does not support repeater mode. Therefore, 2BASE-TL can be oved on long loops and hence can achieve much broader market potential than SS-TL.

#### edRemedy

ete the entire subclause (from Page 383 to Page 409).

d Response Response Status W MENT UNRESOLVED

ered by response to 99018

C 63 S 63.1

D1.0 #416

# P802.3ah Draft 1.1a Comments

C 63 S	63.1	Р	383	L 1	# 99115
WEI, DONG		SB	C Comm	unication	
Comment Type	e TR	Comment Status	6 D		D1.1 #640
This comm	nent is the	same as Comment #	#414 on	Draft 1.0.	
standardiz must be ba ADSL2 is t	ed technolo ased on an based. As a	ANSI standard. The	ct, any st ere does	andardized DSL not exist any AN	). ADSL2 is not a technology in the U.S. SI standard on which ould not adopt any non-
SuggestedRen	nedy				
Delete the	entire subo	clause (from Page 3	83 to Pag	ge 409).	
Proposed Resp COMMEN Covered by	T UNRESC		W		
C 63 S	63.1	Р	383	L 1	# 99116
WEI, DONG		SB	C Comm	unication	
Comment Type	<b>TR</b>	Comment Status	S D		D1.1 #639
This comm	nent is the s	same as Comment #	#416 on l	Draft 1.0.	
J was deve dominant A J for North	eloped prim ADSL varia America.	narily for some Europ nt, G.992.3 does no	bean cou t specify s not suit	ntries where AD the performance able for deploym	) Annex J. Since Annex SL-over-ISDN is the requirements of Annex lent in the U.S. As a Y.
SuggestedRen	nedy				
Delete the	entire subo	clause (from Page 3	83 to Pa	ge 409).	
Proposed Resp COMMEN		Response Status	w		

Covered by response to 99018	
------------------------------	--

C 63 S	63.1.1	P	383	1	30	# 99118
Kimpe, Marc	00.1.1	, ADT		L	50	# [39118
Comment Type	TR	Comment Status	R			D1.1 #32
modification Operation of The comme 63.1.1.3 pag 63.1.1.4.2 p 63.1.3.10 pa 63.1.3.13.1.3 SuggestedReme	s to existin f annex J c nt also app ge 384 line age 386 lin age 395 lin 3 page 397 edy	ne 12 e 6 to 13 7 line 16	be incl tandar	uded or i d.		
Remove the	annex J o	ver POTS option.				
Proposed Respo REJECT.	onse	Response Status	U			
Refer to bas	eline(slide	26) proposed as bas	sis for	the draft		

## P802.3ah Draft 1.1a Comments

C 63	S	63.1.2.11	Р	389	L 5054	#	99119
Artman, Do	bug		Texa	as Instrur	nents		

Comment Type **T** Comment Status **D** D1.1 #797

G.992.3 supports 3 forms of On-line Reconfiguration (OLR): Bitswap, Dynamic Rate Repartioning (DRR) and Seamless Rate Adaptation (SRA). Bitswap adjusts the number of bits applied to specific tones while keeping the total number of bits allocated constant. DRR also keeps the total number of bits constant, but readjusts the number of bits allocated to different latency paths. SRA is capable of modifying not only the bit distribution among all carriers but can also modify the overall data rate by adjusting the total number of bits allocated. In G.992.3 bitswap is required while DRR and SRA are optional. The EFM Task Force needs to decide whether they want to maintain support for DRR and SRA for 2PASS-TL. The other relevant subclauses in Clause 63 are 63.1.2.11.1, 63.1.2.11.1.2 and 63.1.3.16.

#### SuggestedRemedy

EFM should maintain support for bitswap but simplify the OLR protocol and eliminate support for DRR and SRA. DRR is not required with only a single latency path and SRA has no utility if we are nailing the data rate up at 2 Mbps. It is suggested to modify the referenced subclauses as necessary to remove support for DRR and SRA.

Proposed Response	Response Status	W	
COMMENT UNRESC	DLVED		
Vote to reject YES: 8 NO: 12			
Vote to accept YES: 10 NO: 5			
C 63 S 63.1.5 Kimpe, Marc	P <b>4</b> ADTF		# 99120
Comment Type TR		R d Transmit Dawar, EEM	D1.1 #33

The title of clause 63.1.5 is "PSD Masks and Transmit Power- EFM Long Reach system operating in the frequency band over POTS". Clause 63 was meant to include the standard by reference with deviation from the standard highlighted, yet clause 63.1.5 does not exist within annex J and is listed here.

#### SuggestedRemedy

1- Clearly mark what are the changes with respect to existing standards. 2- remove all sections related to annex J over POTS.

Proposed Response	Response Status	U
-------------------	-----------------	---

REJECT.

Refer to baseline(slide 26) proposed as basis for the draft.

See resolution of comment 32.

C 63	S	63.3.1.2	Р	412	L 3443	#	99121	
Artman, Do	bug		Tex	xas Instrum	ients			

Comment Type TR Com

Comment Status D

D1.1 #811

The agreement reached 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 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 line 34, and remove the subclause editor's note in lines 37-43.

Proposed Response	Response Status	W	
-------------------	-----------------	---	--

COMMENT UNRESOLVED

Vote: Accept Doug's remedy: 11 Against: 9

C 63	S	63.3.1.2	P <b>544</b>	L 3238	#	99032	
Artman, E	Doug		Texas Instrur	ments			

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

D1.0 #430

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 COMMENT UNRESOLVED

Duplicate of 811

## P802.3ah Draft 1.1a Comments

C 63 S 63.4.1.2 P 415 L 5054 # 99122	C 63 S 63.4.1.3.3 P 548 L 2122 # 99038
Artman, Doug Texas Instruments	Artman, Doug Texas Instruments
Comment Type TR Comment Status D D1.1 #814	Comment Type TR Comment Status D D1.0 #434
There are no agreements yet within ITU-T as to how to create a 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 COMMENT UNRESOLVED Covered by comment 811  C 63 S 63.4.1.2 P 547548 L 52541 # 99037	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         COMMENT UNRESOLVED         Covered by comment 815         C       63       S       63.4.8.1       P       421       L       3033       #       99124
	Artman, Doug Texas Instruments
Artman, Doug Texas Instruments	Comment Type TR Comment Status D D1.1 #816
Comment Type       TR       Comment Status       D       D1.0 #433         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.       D1.0 #433	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	SuggestedRemedy
Remove this note.	Remove this note.
Proposed Response Response Status W COMMENT UNRESOLVED	Proposed Response Response Status W COMMENT UNRESOLVED
Covered by comment 811	Covered by comment 813
C 63         S 63.4.1.3.3         P 416         L 2931         # 99123           Artman, Doug         Texas Instruments         Texas Instruments	C 63         S 63.4.8.1         P 553         L 1719         # 99039           Artman, Doug         Texas Instruments         Texas Instruments
Comment Type TR Comment Status D D1.1 #815	Comment Type TR Comment Status D D1.0 #435
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 COMMENT UNRESOLVED	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). <i>SuggestedRemedy</i> Remove this note.
Covered by comment 811	Proposed Response Response Status W COMMENT UNRESOLVED Covered by comment 816