CmtID	Name	CL	SubCl	Pg	Ln	Typ	Comment Text	SuggestedRemedy	Response	Editor's Notes
1632	Anslow, Peter	1	1.4.95	12	28	ER	clause 1.4.95 has changed to: "As used in IEEE 802.3 Clause 38. Clause 52, Clause 53, Clause 58, Clause 59, Clause 60, Clause 68 and Clause 75 for fiber optic links, the static loss of light through a link between a transmitter and receiver. It includes the loss of the fiber, connectors, and splices and optional power splitter/combiner (for details, see @@Subclause 75.8.1@@)" 1) Clause 75.8.1 does not exist. 2) The optional splitter/combiner is only applicable to clauses 60 and 75 3) Listing all of the optical clauses forces all future optical amendments to modify this clause 3) clause 75.9.1 (presumably the intended reference) contains: "Insertion loss for SMF fiber optic cabling (channel) is defined at 1270, 1310, 1577 or 1590 nm, depending on the particular PMD. A suitable test method is described in ITU-T G.650.1." This is not suitable as a generic reference for insertion loss.	Change clause 1.4.95 to: "As used in IEEE 802.3 for fiber optic links, the static loss of light through a link between a transmitter and receiver. It includes the loss of the fiber, connectors, and splices and for Clause 60 and Clause 75 the optional power splitter/combiner."	ACCEPT. Moved to clause 01.	Rather than referencing Clause 60 & 75 directly use the phrase "for EPON links" - this is more in keeping with the spirit of the comment.
2269	Hajduczenia, Marek	45	45.2.1.88	28	19	T	Subclauses 45.2.88.1 and 45.2.88.2 do not follow the structure of the remainder of definitions in subclause 45.2.1 i.e. definitions start from 1.176.0 while should start from 1.176.1 to keep consistency with the other subclauses.	Change current subclause 45.2.88.1 to 45.2.88.2 (register 1.176.1) Change current subclause 45.2.88.2 to 45.2.88.1 (register 1.176.0)	ACCEPT. Changed from "E" to "T"	Resolved per comment number 2272
2272	Hajduczenia, Marek	45	45.2.1	29	54	TR	Subclause 45.2.1 is missing FEC functionality description for 10/1GBASE-PRX PMDs, which are essentially asymmetric and use 1 Gb/s link, where FEC is not mandatory. A list of changes is provided in 3av_0809_hajduczenia_2.pdf. Special thanks to all people participating in the revision of the document: @@@	Add Subclauses 45.2.1.92 through 45.2.1.95 as presented in 3av_0809_hajduczenia_2.pdf.	ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. PRX registers should be merged with PR and the whole thing moved to 45.2.3. Complete text in 3av_0809_mandin_5.pdf Straw poll I prefer 1) 1 bit for PR, 1 bit for PRX: 0 2) 1 bit for Tx (FEC encode), 1 bit for Rx (FEC decode): 0 3) 1 bit for PR/PRX: 6 4) Abstain: 15 Add to c76: "76.2.3.3.5 Error monitoring capability The following counters apply to FEC sublayer management and error monitoring. If an MDIO interface is provided (see Clause 45), it is accessed via that interface. If not, it is recommended that an equivalent access be provided. These counters are reset to zero upon read or upon reset of the FEC sublayer. When a counter reaches all ones, it stops counting. The counters' purpose is to help monitor the quality of the link. 76.2.3.3.5.1 Corrected_FEC_codewords_counter 32-bit counter. FEC_corrected_codewords_counter counts once for each corrected FEC codewords in the decoding. This variable is provided by a management interface that may be mapped to the 45.2.3.32 register (3.77 and 3.78). 76.2.3.3.5.2 Uncorrected_FEC_codewords_counter 32-bit counter. FEC_uncorrected_codewords_counter counts once	Modified style of additions to c76 to be consistent with other counters in the clause. Placed additions to 45.2.3 before BER Monitor to align with appearance in c76. Although no explicit directions were given, the old text at 45.2.1.88 to 45.2.1.91 including Table 45-68 was removed.
2254	Ganga, Ilango	45	45.2.3	30	6	ER	Provide table title with Table number for the PCS registers listed in this page.	As per comment.	ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Insert the following heading text to line 6: "Table 45-82-PCS registers".Insert the following heading text to line 16: "Table 45-83 PCS control 1 register bit definitions"	resolved per comment number 2272

CmtID	Name	CL	SubCl	Pg	Ln	Typ	Comment Text	SuggestedRemedy	Response	Editor's Notes
2E+05	Lynskey, Eric	45	45.2.3.29	30	27	T	There is some missing description of the BER monitor behavior. Back in 3av_0801_mandin_2.pdf, the idea was to set the hi_ber flag in the 10GBASE-R and 10GBASE-T status register. If we still want to do that, then we need to add and show the modified register definition. The other option would be to create a new register only for PR and PRX. Since we've added register 3.74, it may make sense to put this functionality here and update the Clause 76 text as appropriate. Also, 10GBASE-R and 10GBASE-T have another register that represents a latched version ofthe high BER flag. We need to decide if we want this functionality, too.	Create new 10GBASE-PR and 10/1GBASE-PRX BER Monitor Status register modeled after 10GBASE-R status and 10GBASE-R status 2 registers.	ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. --- 18.09.2008 --- See 3av_0809_lynskey_2.pdf for a detailed list of changes to the draft. -------------------- == Resolution from Denver 0806 Meeting == REJECT. This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter. To be resubmitted by commenter against next draft ==================================	Placed additions to 45.2.3 after BER Monitor to align with appearance in c76 with approval of commenter.
2255	Ganga, Ilango	45	45.5	31	4	ER	Update appropriate PICS tables as applicable to 802.3av	Per comment	ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. For list of changes, see 3av_0809_kramer_6.pdf.	Corrected wording in Table 45.5.3.7 to match c45.2.3
1578	Anslow, Peter	56	56.1	34	32	E	The third paragraph ends "while symmetric 10 Gb/s and asymmetric EPONs are referred to as 10G-EPON." This would be better as "while the symmetric 10 Gb/s and asymmetric EPONs are referred to as 10G-EPON."	Change the end of the third paragraph from "while symmetric 10 Gb/s and asymmetric EPONs are referred to as 10G-EPON." to "while the symmetric 10 Gb/s and asymmetric EPONs are referred to as 10G-EPON."	ACCEPT. Moved to c56	Later edits for comment number 1981 impacted resolution.
2277	Hajduczenia, Marek	56	56.1.2	38	15	ER	Lines 15 through 17 are affected. Text "layer defined in Clause 65@@Clause 60@@, and an optional FEC Forward Error Correction (FEC) function defined in Clause 65.Clause 65;" contains several errors: - Doubled reference to Clause 65 - Reference to Clause 65 and then 60. Change the indicated block of text as proposed in the suggested remedy.	Suggest to change the text: "layer defined in Clause 65@@Clause 60@@, and an optional FEC Forward Error Correction (FEC) function defined in Clause 65.Clause 65;" to "layer defined in @@Clause 65@@, and an optional FEC Forward Error Correction (FEC) function defined in @@Clause 65@@;"	ACCEPT.	Resolution implemented per comment number 1640 approved in TF meeting.
1751	LANDRY, MATTHEW	56	56.1.2	38	15	E	Regarding "Clause 65@@Clause 60@@" I am not sure why the 'external' link does not match the 'local' reference. Further, why is there both a local reference and an external link? On line 16 there appear to be two local links, which both agree in number. And on line 21 there is only an external link. Line 48 has lopsided ampersand delimiters. I believe I understand wanting to mark external links with ampersands. I don't fully comprehend the unpredicable use of local links concurrent with external links, especially when they sometimes don't agree.	Check links for proper reference, and eliminate unneeded links, either local or external.	ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. See comment #2277	Resolution implemented per comment number 1640 approved in TF meeting.
2278	Hajduczenia, Marek	56	56.1.2	38	20	T	10G-EPON does not use 10GBASE-R PCS but defined its own PCS i.e. 10GBASE-PR. Change reference to "10GBASE-R" PCS to "10GBASE-PR" PCS	Change "use the 10GBASE-R PCS" to "use the 10GBASE-PR PCS defined in @@Clause 76@@". Make sure that the "@@Clause 76@@" is changed to a live cross reference link.	ACCEPT.	Resolution conflicts with comment #2419 resolution. Implemented wording a composite created by the Editor.
1687	Jessica, Jiang	56	56.1.2	38	20	ER	The sentence is not very clear on the following: 1) PCS is not only 10GBASE-R 2) mandatory FEC is applied only for 10Gbps data. Suggest to rephase the sentence.		ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. See #2278	Resolution conflicts with comment #2419 resolution. Implemented wording a composite created by the Editor.

CmtID	Name	CL	SubCl	Pg	Ln	Typ	Comment Text	SuggestedRemedy	Response	Editor's Notes
2419	DIAB, WAEL	56	56.1.2	38	21	T	Under section (b) there is no mention of what PCS is used for the case of 1Gb/s upstream	Please add the reference and pointer to the appropriate clauses	ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Change "The P2MP PHYs use the 10BASE-R PCS, "to "The P2MP PHYs for the symmetric 10G-EPON use the 10BASE-R PCS (see @@Clause 75@@ whereas the P2MP PHYs for the asymmetric 10G-EPON use the 10BASE-R PCS for the downstream direction (see @@Clause 75@@) and 1000BASE-X PCS (see @@Clause 65) for the upstream direction."	Resolution conflicts with comment #2278 resolution. Implemented wording a composite created by the Editor.
1643	Anslow, Peter	56	56.1.3	39	22	ER	item g) starts "10/1GBASE-PRX-D2 and 10/1GBASE-PRX-U1," this should be "10/1GBASE-PRX-D2 and 10/1GBASE-PRX-U2,"	in item g) change "10/1GBASE-PRX-D2 and 10/1GBASE-PRX-U1," to "10/1GBASE-PRX-D2 and 10/1GBASE-PRX-U2,"	ACCEPT. Moved to c56	Comments 1643, 1683, 1703 & 2001 suggest a correction per Table 75–2 in D2.0. However the table is in error, no "U2" exists. As a result there is no change due to these comments.
1683	Jessica, Jiang	56	56.1.3	39	22	E	typo "10/1GBASE-PRX-U1" should be "10/1GBASE-PRX-U2"	change "10/1GBASE-PRX-U1" to "10/1GBASE-PRX-U2"	ACCEPT.	Comments 1643, 1683, 1703 & 2001 suggest a correction per Table 75–2 in D2.0. However the table is in error, no "U2" exists. As a result there is no change due to these comments.
1703	Lin, Rujian	56	56.1.3	39	22	E	10/1GBASE-PRX-D2 and 10/1GBASE-PRX-U1, creating a PRX20 power budget,	Corrected as "10/1GBASE-PRX-D2 and 10/1GBASE-PRX-U2, creating a PRX20 power budget",	ACCEPT.	Comments 1643, 1683, 1703 & 2001 suggest a correction per Table 75–2 in D2.0. However the table is in error, no "U2" exists. As a result there is no change due to these comments.
2001	Brown, Alan	56	56.1.3	39	22	ER	Fifth list item references incorrect PMD.	Correct "10/1GBASE-PRX-U1" to "10/1GBASE-PRX-U2".	ACCEPT.	Comments 1643, 1683, 1703 & 2001 suggest a correction per Table 75–2 in D2.0. However the table is in error, no "U2" exists. As a result there is no change due to these comments.
2392	Law, David	56	56.1.3	40	24	T	Why is the Receive rate being used for the Rate column, for example for 10/1GBASE-PRX-D1 the rate is listed as 1000MB/s.	For each of the dual-rate PHYs list both the TX and RX rate, for example for the 10/1GBASE-PRX-D1 PHY list: 10Gb/s transmit 1000Mb/s receive	ACCEPT.	Abbreviated with (tx) and (rx) with approval from commenter.
2105	Kramer, Glen	56	56.1.3	40	31	T	Incorrect PMDs are listed in this table	10/1GBASE-PRX-U4 should be 10/1GBASE-PRX-U3 10GBASE-PR-U2 does not exist. Remove the row.	ACCEPT.	Rather than removing row for 10GBASE-PR-U2 changed to 10GBASE-PR-U1 (at distance 20 km), since removing the entry would communicate there is no "U" EFM signaling system for the ONU at 20 km distance.
1985	Dawe, Piers	56	56.1.3	40	37	T	10GBASE-PR-U2: does it exist?	Delete row? Also problem in Table 56-3.	ACCEPT.	Rather than removing row for 10GBASE-PR-U2 changed to 10GBASE-PR-U1 (at distance 20 km), since removing the entry would communicate there is no "U" EFM signaling system for the ONU at 20 km distance.
2390	Law, David	56	56.1.3	42		T	100BASE-LX10 and 1000BASE-LX10 are both footnoted as 'Symmetric' yet the 10GBASE-PR PHYs, which subclause 75.2.1.2 defines as Symmetric, is not so footnoted - this is confusing. Further in Clause 65 of IEEE Std 802.3-2005 it is stated that 'The architecture is asymmetrical, based on a tree and branch topology utilizing passive optical splitters.', so if the PON architecture is asymmetric it is odd to have 75.2.1.2 define 'Symmetric, 10Gb/s power budgets (PR type). This confusion is being caused by a lack of clarity between symmetric (P2P) and asymmetric (PON) architectures and symmetric (10GBASE-PR) and asymmetric (10/1GBASE-PRX) data rate PHYs which operate on an asymmetric architectures.	One option would be to remove the use of the term asymmetric architecture from Clause 64 and 65 - for example Clause 56 doesn't use that terminology in relation to PONs - then all is required is another annotation for this table. If if symmetric and asymmetric is still going to be used in both meanings qualify the new use with the words 'data rate'.	ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. See response to comment #1980 Terms will be replace in open clauses.	Later edits for comment number 1981 impacted resolution
1947	Dawe, Piers	76	76.2.2.4.	##	17	T	If you need to use a capital pi	Add it to the table of symbols, return updated table to WG chair and vice-chair	ACCEPT.	Sent e-mail, missing "ALT" keycode

CmtID	Name	CL	SubCl	Pg	Ln	Typ	Comment Text	SuggestedRemedy	Response	Editor's Notes
2109	Lynskey, Eric	76	76.2.3.1.	##	3	T	There is no PICS for this shall statement. A PICS should be added or the shall should be removed. A PICS item should be added as item SM5 in 76.4.4.7.	SM5, OLT synchronizer, 76.2.3.1.4, Meets the requirements of Figure 76-19, OLT:FEC:M, Yes[] No[]	ACCEPT. Changed from "E" to "T" See resolution to comment #2110	Comment number 2131 conflicts with resolution for 2109 & 2110 - implemented 2110.
2131	Lynskey, Eric	76	76.2.3.2	##	49	T	If the previous comment for the OLT synchronizer is accepted, then the same should be done for the ONU.	Replace start of sentence with "The OLT synchronizer forms a bit stream...". Remove PICS item SM3.	ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. The ONU synchronizer forms a bit stream." Remove PICS item SM3	Comment number 2131 conflicts with resolution for 2109 & 2110 - implemented 2110.
1628	Anslow, Peter	76	76.3.2.1.	##	20	E	This says "@@Figure 75-3@@ and @@Figure 75-4@@ illustrate the tests setup for the OLT PMA receiver (upstream) TCDR time." but Figures 75-3 and 75-4 are just the block diagrams of 10GBASE-PR and 10GBASE-PRX	If these are the correct figures then change the text to: "The OLT PMA receiver (upstream) TCDR time is measured in an arrangement as shown in Figure 75-3 and Figure 75-4."	ACCEPT. [Moved to C76] [Clause and subclause number was added]	Resolution to comment number 1628 conflicts with comment 2363, 2363 implemented.
2363	Law, David	76	76.3.2.1.	##	20	E	I don't think either 75-3 or 75-4 test setup, they are labeled as block diagrams and I don't see any test equipment in these figures	Correct the text 'Figure 75-3 and Figure 75-4 illustrate the tests setup ..'.	ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Change "@@Figure 75-3@@ and @@Figure 75-4@@ illustrate the tests setup for the OLT PMA receiver (upstream) TCDR time. The test assumes that there is an optical PMD transmitter ." to: "The OLT PMA Receiver TCDR time test assumes that there is an optical PMD transmitter ." (CDR subscripted)	Resolution to comment number 1628 conflicts with comment 2363, 2363 implemented.
2040	Kramer, Glen	76	76.4	##	1	T	No point of listing every single PMD subtype in the subclause title	Use "76.4 Protocol implementation conformance statement (PICS) proforma for Clause 76, Reconciliation Sublayer (RS), Physical Coding Sublayer (PCS), and Physical Media Attachment (PMA) for point-to-multipoint media, types 10GBASE-PR and 10/1GBASE-PRX"	ACCEPT. Gladly	Resolution to comment 1936 changed clause title, aligned PICS title with clause.
2042	Kramer, Glen	76	76.4.2.2	##	5	T	Incorrect clause name	"point-to-point" should be "point-to-multipoint"	ACCEPT.	Resolution to comment 1936 changed clause title, aligned PICS title with clause.
2129	Lynskey, Eric	76	76.4.4.4	##	14	T	There is no PICS item for the OLT data detector, and only one state diagram is mentioned for the ONU data detector.	Replace item DD3 and add item DD4: DD3, ONU State diagrams, 76.2.2.5.6, Meets the requirements of Figure 76-17 and Figure 76-18b. ONU:M, Yes[] No[] DD4, OLT State diagrams, 76.2.2.5.6, Meets the requirements of Figure 76-17 and Figure 76-18a. OLT:M, Yes[] No[]	ACCEPT.	Cannot Cross Reference to Fig 18a/b only 18.

CmtID	Name	CL	SubCl	Pg	Ln	Typ	Comment Text	SuggestedRemedy	Response	Editor's Notes
2044	Kramer, Glen	76	76.4.4.5	##	21	T	Incorrect PICs requirement "If the minimum IPG was transmitted after a frame, then 4 IDLE control character are deleted for every 27 vectors transmitted." We delete 4 vectors containing idles, not 4 idles. This has been corrected in clause text, but is missed in PICS.	replace "If the minimum IPG was transmitted after a frame, then 4 IDLE control character are deleted for every 27 vectors transmitted." with "If the minimum IPG was transmitted after a frame, then 4 vectors containing IDLE control character are deleted for every 27 vectors transmitted.	ACCEPT.	Resolution to comment 2044 conflicts with 2128, implemented 2128.
2128	Lynskey, Eric	76	76.4.4.5	##	22	T	There is no associated "shall" requirement for PICS item AIC1. We either need to add a requirement or should remove the PICS item. Also, it is not clear what this item is trying to describe. It is an ONU specific item, but the only ONU specific function in this block of text refers to the alignment of the start character. It seems that the behavior described by this item should be fully covered by compliance with the state machine, and therefore this item is not necessary.	Remove item AIC1.	ACCEPT.	Resolution to comment 2044 conflicts with 2128, implemented 2128.
2132	Lynskey, Eric	76	76.4.4.7	##	5	T	I cannot find the shall statement associated with PICS item SM1. I did a search on all locations of Figure 76-12 and did not see anything with a "shall". A requirement should be added or the PICS item should be removed.	Remove item SM1.	ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Change "Note - For the (255,223) Reed-Solomon code, the symbol size equals one octet. The d0 is identified as the LSB and d7 is identified as the MSB bit in accordance with the conventions of Subclause @@3.1.1@@. See Figure 76-12." to read "For the (255,223) Reed-Solomon code, the symbol size equals one octet. The d0 is identified as the LSB and d7 is identified as the MSB in accordance with the conventions of 3.1.1. Bit ordering shall be as illustrated in Figure 76-12." maintain subscripting In PICS pg 144 Add reference to SM1 76.2.2.4.1.	Resolution to comment 2045 conflicts with 2132, implemented 2132
2045	Kramer, Glen	76	76.4.4.7	##	5	T	Missing clause number for item SM1	Use 76.2.2.4	ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. See resolution to 2132 & 2134	Resolution to comment 2045 conflicts with 2132, implemented 2132
2110	Lynskey, Eric	76	76.4.4.7	##	7	E	Item SM2 should be reworked to reference the ONU and have the subclause updated.	SM2, ONU synchronization, 76.2.3.2.5, Meets the requirements of Figure 76-21, ONU:FEC:M, Yes[] No[]	ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Change SM2 a proposed in suggested remedy Add: SM3, OLT synchronization, 76.2.3.1.4, Meets the requirements of Figure 76-19, OLT:FEC:M, Yes[] No[]	Resolution to comment 2131 conflicts with comments 2109 & 2110 - implemented 2110. Renumbered existing SM3/SM4
2126	Lynskey, Eric	76	76.4.4.9	##	27	T	Item DV1 seems to be incorrect. It points to a non-existent subclause and is inconsistent with the requirement of 76.3.1.3.2.	Replace subclause with 76.3.1.3.2. Reword value/comment to refer to one time_quantum instead of 16-bit times.	ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Replace subclause with 76.1.3.2. Reword value/comment to refer to [TBD] time_quantum instead of 16-bit times. (achievable delay variation is still in question). See comment #2086 for value of [TBD]	Note: Comment #2086 was rejected so the value of "[TBD]" was not determined. Pecs entry includes "[TBD]" with adjacent Editors Note that this needs to be resolved.

CmtID	Name	CL	SubCl	Pg	Ln	Typ	Comment Text	SuggestedRemedy	Response	Editor's Notes
1819	Dudek, Mike	75	75.11.3	82	35	TR	Decreasing the split ratio while increasing the fiber length is not supported by the other specifications. Excess chromatic dispersion in long lengths could occur and is not covered by the optical budget (eg a split ratio of 2:1 could allow 60km of fiber)	Remove "or vice versa" on line 35, and change the sentence before to "The only requirements are that the resulting channel insertion loss is with the limits specified in Table 75-1 and the maximum reach in table 75-1 is not exceeded" and remove the > or = in table 75-1. Alternatively introduce an abolute maximum chromatic dispersion limit for the fiber connection, and use this maximum chromatic dispersion in the TDP tests.	ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. <CR>Remove "or vice versa" on line 35 and change the sentence before to "The only requirements are that the resulting channel insertion loss is with the limits specified in Table 75-1 and the maximum reach in table 75-1 is not exceeded" and remove the > or = in table 75-1.	There is inconsistency with statements in clause 75 and 76, where reach is mentioned as nominal and not maximum.
1929	Dawe, Piers	75	75.3.1.1	55	44	T	This sentence "An upper bound to the delay through the PMD is required for predictable operation of the MAC Control MPCP operation" is well past its sell-by date. If the fibre path can be tens of kilometres long, the 4 time-quanta or 40 m worth of the PMD is hardly significant. But, isn't there a requirement that the delay through the PMD should not change too rapidly?	Delete the offending sentence (you don't have to replace it with anything; standards don't have to give their reasons). Refer to 76.1.3.2.	ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. <CR>Change text <CR>"An upper bound to the delay through the PMD is required for predictable operation of the MAC Control MPCP operation. The PMD shall introduce a constant transmit delay of not more than 4 time-quanta and constant receive delay of not more than 4 time-quanta. A description of the overall system delay constraints can be found in @@Subclause 77.3.2.4@@, and the definition for the time_quantum can be found in @@Subclause 77.2.2.1@@." <CR>to <CR>"The PMD shall introduce a constant transmit delay of not more than 4 time_quanta and constant receive delay of not more than 4 time_quanta. A description of the overall system delay constraints can be found in 76.1.3.2 and the definition for the time_quantum can be found in 77.2.2.1."	#1929 makes a change on the whole block of text and #1930 further modifies it. This is how it is implemented i.e #1929 will be done first and #1930 follows, updating the text already modified by #1929.
1930	Dawe, Piers	75	75.3.1.1	55	45	T	The PMD shall introduce a constant transmit delay of not more than 4 time-quanta and constant receive delay of not more than 4 time-quanta. How constant is constant enough?	?	ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. <CR>"The PMD shall introduce a transmit delay of not more than 4 time_quanta with the variability of no more than 0.5 time_quanta, and a receive delay of not more than 4 time-quanta with the variability of no more than 0.5 time_quanta."<CR><CR>Update the PICS to match these modified "shall" statements.	
2290	Hajduczenia, Marek	75	75.6.1.1	71	1	TR	Figure 75-8 has some issues:<CR>- EPON wavelength plan is not needed<CR>- PRX upstream channel is not depicted properly<CR>Suggested to replace Figure 75-8 with the contents of 3av_0809_hajduczenia_3.pdf	Suggested to replace Figure 75-8 with the contents of 3av_0809_hajduczenia_3.pdf.	ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. <CR>Align the height in (a) to match all other bands. <CR>3av_0809_hajduczenia_4.pdf is referred to.	The scope of this comment was extended during implementation inthe result of comment #2158, which calls for changes in the wavelength band. Effectively, 1580 - 1600 nm band was removed from the figure in question.
1599	Anslow, Peter	75	75.7	73	50	T	The text states "Therefore, damage threshold (max) of the 1/10 Gb/s dual-rate receiver shall comply with the 10 Gb/s receiver specification in Table 75-6, even when receiving 1 Gb/s signal."<CR>1) it is inappropriate to use "shall" in an informative clause<CR>2) why should the receiver have to comply with the 10G damage threshold when actually receiving a 1G signal?	Change to "Therefore, the damage threshold (max) of the 1/10 Gb/s dual-rate receiver should comply with the 10 Gb/s receiver specification in Table 75-6."	ACCEPT. <CR>[Changed from "E" to "T"]<CR>Implement together with comment #2373	After the changes introduced in this comment, the block of text seems broken.
2144	Lynskey, Eric	77	77.2.2.7	##	8	T	This comment is against Figure 77-10. The MA_DATA.indication primitive needs to include the Length/Type field. The same change should be made in two places on line 8 and also on line 12.	MA_DATA.indication(DA, SA, {Length/Type, data_rx}, receiveStatus)	ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. <CR>Detailed list of changes is included in 3av_0809_lynskey_1.pdf.	The scope of these comments was extended during implementation: originally changes were limited to figures and introduction of new variable to 77.2.2.3. Definitions were also inserted in section 77.3.3.2, 77.3.4.2 and 77.3.5.2. Changes were introduced to figures: 77-23, 77-26, 77-17, 77-16 and 77-15, where "data" was replaced with "m_sdu_ctl" keeping it in line with the appropriate state diagrams.
2146	Lynskey, Eric	77	77.2.2.7	##	8	T	This comment is against Figure 77-11. The MA_DATA.indication primitive needs to include the Length/Type field. The same change should be made in two places on line 8 and also on line 12.	MA_DATA.indication(...) * Length/Type = MAC_Control_Type	ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. <CR>Detailed list of changes is included in 3av_0809_lynskey_1.pdf.	
2135	Lynskey, Eric	77	77.2.2.7	##	9	T	This comment is against Figure 77-12. There are three parameters that are part of the MA_DATA.request primitive: DA, SA, and data_tx. In the 2005 version of the standard, there were four parameters that were passed in the TransmitFrame function: DA, SA, Length/Type, and data_tx. The way it is currently written, the Length/Type field is included in the data_tx parameter. This means that the indices are off by the length of the Length/Type field. The Length/Type field should be explicitly added into the primitive such that the data parameter is the concatenation of Length/Type and data_tx.	On lines 9 and 36, replace with MA_DATA.request(DA, SA, {Length/Type, data_tx}).	ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. <CR>Detailed list of changes is included in 3av_0809_lynskey_1.pdf.	

CmtID	Name	CL	SubCl	Pg	Ln	Typ	Comment Text	SuggestedRemedy	Response	Editor's Notes
2136	Lynskey, Eric	77	77.2.2.7	##	9	T	This comment is against Figure 77-13. The MA_DATA.request parameters need to be modified (see comment against Figure 77-12 for details).	On lines 9 and 37, replace with MA_DATA.request(DA, SA, {Length/Type, data_tx}).	ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. <CR>Detailed list of changes is included in 3av_0809_lynskey_1.pdf.	
2138	Lynskey, Eric	77	77.3.3.6	##	36	T	This comment is against Figure 77-18. The MA_DATA.request primitive needs to include the MAC Control value in the Length/Type field. Also, there is no data variable in this state diagram, but rather a data_tx variable.	MA_DATA.request(DA, SA, {MAC_Control_type, data_tx}).	ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. <CR>Detailed list of changes is included in 3av_0809_lynskey_1.pdf.	
2139	Lynskey, Eric	77	77.3.3.6	##	47	T	This comment is against Figure 77-20. The MA_DATA.request primitive needs to include the MAC Control value in the Length/Type field. Also, there is no data variable in this state diagram, but rather a data_tx variable.	MA_DATA.request(DA, SA, {MAC_Control_type, data_tx}).	ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. <CR>Detailed list of changes is included in 3av_0809_lynskey_1.pdf.	
2140	Lynskey, Eric	77	77.3.3.6	##	14	T	This comment is against Figure 77-21. The MA_DATA.request primitive needs to include the MAC Control value in the Length/Type field. Also, there is no data variable in this state diagram, but rather a data_tx variable. The same change should be made on lines 14 and 41.	MA_DATA.request(DA, SA, {MAC_Control_type, data_tx}).	ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. <CR>Detailed list of changes is included in 3av_0809_lynskey_1.pdf.	
2141	Lynskey, Eric	77	77.3.3.6	##	35	T	This comment is against Figure 77-22. The MA_DATA.request primitive needs to include the MAC Control value in the Length/Type field. Also, there is no data variable in this state diagram, but rather a data_tx variable. The same change should be made on lines 16, 35, 36, and 48.	MA_DATA.request(DA, SA, {MAC_Control_type, data_tx}).	ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. <CR>Detailed list of changes is included in 3av_0809_lynskey_1.pdf.	
2142	Lynskey, Eric	77	77.3.4.6	##	21	T	This comment is against Figure 77-25. The MA_DATA.request primitive needs to include the MAC Control value in the Length/Type field. Also, there is no data variable in this state diagram, but rather a data_tx variable. The same change should be made in two places on line 22.	MA_DATA.request(DA, SA, {MAC_Control_type, data_tx}).	ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. <CR>Detailed list of changes is included in 3av_0809_lynskey_1.pdf.	
2143	Lynskey, Eric	77	77.3.5.6	##	43	T	This comment is against Figure 77-25. The MA_DATA.request primitive needs to include the MAC Control value in the Length/Type field. Also, there is no data variable in this state diagram, but rather a data_tx variable. The same change should be made in two places on line 43.	MA_DATA.request(DA, SA, {MAC_Control_type, data_tx}).	ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. <CR>Detailed list of changes is included in 3av_0809_lynskey_1.pdf.	
2115	Lynskey, Eric	77	77.5.4.4	##	15	T	The value/comment for item MP5 is incorrect. The 0x55 pattern and burst delimiter is transmitted during the synchronization time.	Replace value/comment with, "Transmit sync pattern (0x55...), BD, and IDLE."	ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. <CR>[Changed from "E" to "T"]<CR><CR>On page 202 replace "shall" (ln. 19) statement with "ONU calculates the effective grant length by subtracting the syncTime, laserOnTime, laserOffTime, BURST_DELIMITER and END_BURST_DELIMITER from the grant length it received from the OLT."<CR><CR>Apply the same change to Sync Time description in REGISTER MPCPDU.<CR><CR>Remove PICS statement MP5.	unclear which part of the Sync Time parameter description in REGISTER MPCPDU is affected by changes. Decided to change the description as follows: "Sync Time. This is an unsigned 16-bit value signifying the required synchronization time of the OLT receiver. ONU calculates the effective grant length by subtracting the syncTime, laserOnTime, laserOffTime, BURST_DELIMITER and END_BURST_DELIMITER from the grant length it received from the OLT. The value is counted in 1 time_quantum increments. The advertised value includes synchronization requirement on all receiver elements including PMD, PMA and PCS."
2137	Lynskey, Eric	77	77.2.2	##	30	T	In some figures, such as Figure 77-15, the MA_DATA.request primitive is shown with its parameters. In other figures, such as Figure 77-6, no parameters are shown. A consistent method should be decided upon.	Show parameters in the following figures: 77-3, 77-6, 77-7, 77-8,	ACCEPT.	Comment calls for demonstration of parameters in Figures 77-3, 77-6, 77-7, 77-8. Extra changes to Figure 77-3 were made (MCF:MA_DATA.indication changed to MCF:MA_DATA.indication(…), MA_CONTROL.request to MA_CONTROL.request(…), MCF:MA_DATA.request to MCF:MA_DATA.request(...), MA_CONTROL.indication to MA_CONTROL.indication(...))