

Cl 00 SC 0 P L # 2868  
Frank , Chang Vitesse

Comment Type E Comment Status R joint UnCngTxt-OOS  
Confusing for abbreviation: RS=Reconciliation Sublayer vs. RS=Reed-Solomon

SuggestedRemedy  
??

Response Response Status C

REJECT.  
Task Force agrees with this resolution.  
  
Passed by Voice without opposition  
  
Commenter agreed with this resolution.

- 1) It is noted that the Draft 2.2 document is technically correct and complete.
- 2) The above comment is made against unchanged text and therefore out of scope for this ballot.
- 3) The task force recognizes that the change suggested below would be an improvement and mandates the editor to resubmit this comment against draft D3.0. The editor shall provide the following proposed response:

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

In all cases where "RS " referes to Reed-Solomon change to "RS(255,223)".

In all cases where "RS (255,223)" appears change to "RS(255,223)"  
[remove space between "S" and "("]

On Pg 162 change FE1 and FE2 to change Reed-Solomon (RS) " to "RS(255,223) "

In this way the meaning is always clear from the context.

Cl 00 SC 0 P L # 202420  
DIAB, WAEL BROADCOM

Comment Type TR Comment Status R  
The nomenclature used for the Gigabit technologies is inconsistant with EFM and 802.3.

SuggestedRemedy  
Please change all references of 1GBASE to 1000BASE including in the 10/1GBASE so it is 10G/1000BASE

Response Response Status C

REJECT.  
The nomenclature for all new PHYs was approved by the TF and presented to the 802.3 working group without significant opposition.  
This is a new PMD name and does not need to use same units as 1000BASE PMDs.  
10/1GBASE provides most concise name for the PMD capabilities.

Vote:  
Approve this Response  
For: 28  
Against: 0  
Abstain: 0

Added at November 2008 meeting:  
The TF believes that it is important to have the same units to describe the speed in both directions.

Cl 00 SC 31.2 P417 L25 # 2866  
Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type TR Comment Status R UnCngTxt-OOS

31.2 says 'MAC Control clients may include the Bridge Relay Entity, LLC, or other applications.' With the proposed Annex 31 'organization specific' transmission channel, there would be another client. But is it possible to have multiple MAC Control clients of the same MAC Control sublayer instance? Refer to unsatisfied TRs.

SuggestedRemedy

Either: State what the new MAC Control client is. Is it an OMCI? Give a reference to the appropriate ITU-T document(s). Explain about multiple MAC Control clients. Or, State what the new MAC Control EXTENSION client is. Is it an OMCI? Give a reference to the appropriate ITU-T document(s). Either way, modify the diagram to show the two parallel sublayers above MAC Control.

Response Response Status W

REJECT.

The WG chair rules that this comment is out of scope not requiring recirculation.

OMCI fits perfectly into the category of "other applications". The MAC Control Client is outside of the scope of 802.3 standard; the standard does not restrict MAC Control Client from including multiple functions, OMCI being one of them. No changes to the draft are needed.

The comment does not require recirculation for the following reasons:

- 1) It was submitted by a balloter who voted "Disapprove" on the previous ballot, thus the balloter's vote does not change.
- 2) The comment restates comments #2709 & #2710 from draft D2.1 ballot, which was submitted by the same balloter, and rejected. It can therefore be considered a "pile on" to the balloter's own comment.
- 3) The comment is made against text which did not change between D2.1 and D2.2 (i.e. did not change in the recirculated draft).

Cl 00 SC 31.2 P417 L25 # 212709  
Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type TR Comment Status R delayed until Annex31

31.2 says 'MAC Control clients may include the Bridge Relay Entity, LLC, or other applications.' If there is a purpose to the proposed Annex 31 'organization specific' transmission channel, someone must have another client in mind. Refer to unsatisfied TRs.

SuggestedRemedy

State what the new MAC Control client is. Is it an OMCI? Give a reference to the appropriate ITU-T document(s).

Response Response Status U

REJECT.

OMCI fits perfectly into the category of "other applications". No changes to the draft are believed to be needed.

[was c31, move to c00 as c31 is not in the draft]

[page number is against 802.3ay D2.3]

Cl 00 SC 56.1 P53 L2426 # 2808  
Lin, Rujian Shanghai Luster Terab

Comment Type E Comment Status R UnCngTxt-OOS

In Figure 56-2, the ODN is composed of Fiber and Optical distributor combiner(s)

SuggestedRemedy

Propose to change the block " Optical distributor combiner(s)" into " Optical splitter(s)/combiner(s)".

The same change ia applied to Figure 56-3, Figure 56-4, Figure 75-1, Figure 75-2, Figure 76-1, Figure 76-2, Figure 77-2, Figure 77-3.

Response Response Status C

REJECT.

[comment is against the unchanged text and outside the scope of this ballot]

[moved to c00]

See resolution to comment #2832

Cl 00 SC 75.2 P70 L1 # 2834  
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corporation

Comment Type E Comment Status R UnCngTxt-OOS

This comment is about figure 75-1 but also applies to 75-2, 76-1, 76-2, 77-2 and 77-3. In the diagram, we have grayed boxes, which indicate sublayers defined in this clause. Why did we add back "(Clause XX)" in the sublayer in the diagram? Isn't it clear what grayed out sublayer means?

SuggestedRemedy

Either remove "(Clause XX)" from grayed out sublayers in figures 75-1, 75-2, 76-1, 76-2, 77-2 and 77-3 or remove the gray colour and explanation what it is.

Response Response Status C

REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

[comment is against the unchanged text and outside the scope of this ballot]

Remove "(Clause xx)"  
[Changed to Clause 00]

Cl 00 SC 76.2.3.2 P121 L37 # 2801  
Mandin, Jeff PMC Sierra

Comment Type E Comment Status R UnCngTxt-OOS joint

Currently, the "Delay Constraints" for the PHY layer (ie. RS, PCS, and PMA sublayers) appears in the "summary of major concepts" of the RS.

It seems more appropriate for the section to appear at the beginning of c76.

SuggestedRemedy

Move 76.2.3.2 to after 76.1.1

Response Response Status C

REJECT.  
[moved from cl 76 to cl 00]  
Task Force agrees with this resolution.  
Passed by Voice without opposition

Commenter agreed with this resolution.

- 1) It is noted that the Draft 2.2 document is technically correct and complete.
- 2) The above comment is made against unchanged text and therefore out of scope for this ballot.
- 3) The task force recognizes that the change suggested below would be an improvement and mandates the editor to resubmit this comment against draft D3.0. The editor shall provide the following proposed response:

PROPOSED  
ACCEPT.

Move to new subclause 76.1.2 and update all references to old 76.2.3.2

Cl 01 SC 1.1 P19 L33 # 2860  
Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type E Comment Status A

1.1 Normative references  
should be

SuggestedRemedy

1.3 Normative references

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

The TF and WG chairs rule that it is not a substantive change and the editor will use the editorial license to make this change.

**Cl 01**      **SC 1.1**                      **P19**              **L 54**              # **2863**  
Dawe, Piers                              Avago Technologies

**Comment Type**    **T**                      **Comment Status**    **R**

Following improvements to 31C.1, need to add two more references, either here or in Annex A.

**SuggestedRemedy**

Add ITU-T G.984 and ITU-T G.983 to the references.

**Response**                      **Response Status**    **C**

REJECT.  
Task Force agrees with this resolution.  
Passed by Voice without opposition

Commenter agreed with this resolution.

- 1) It is noted that the Draft 2.2 document is technically correct and complete.
- 2) The above comment is made against unchanged text and therefore out of scope for this ballot.
- 3) The task force recognizes that the change suggested below would be an improvement and mandates the editor to resubmit this comment against draft D3.0. The editor shall provide the following proposed response:

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
Add the following references:

ITU-T Recommendation G.983.1, 2005 - Broadband optical access systems based on Passive Optical Networks (PON).

ITU-T Recommendation G.984.3, 2008 - Gigabit-capable Passive Optical Networks (G-PON): Transmission convergence layer specification.

**Cl 01**      **SC 1.3**                      **P20**              **L 3**              # **2854**  
Dawe, Piers                              Avago Technologies

**Comment Type**    **E**                      **Comment Status**    **A**

For TIA-455-127-A, you have already given the (year) date just before the title. Also, internationally, there is no month 00 ;)

**SuggestedRemedy**

Delete 'Date:11/00/06'. Consider deleting 'Revision:A'.

**Response**                      **Response Status**    **C**

PROPOSED REJECT.  
Task Force agrees with this resolution.  
Passed by Voice without opposition

Commenter agreed with this resolution.

- 1) It is noted that the Draft 2.2 document is technically correct and complete.
- 2) The task force recognizes that the change suggested below would be an improvement and mandates the editor to resubmit this comment against draft D3.0. The editor shall provide the following proposed response:

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Cl 01**      **SC 1.4**                      **P20**              **L 11**              # **2827**  
Hajduczenia, Marek                      ZTE Corporation

**Comment Type**    **E**                      **Comment Status**    **A**

Text reads "See IEEE 802.3 Clause 75, Clause 76 and Clause 77" - missing comma

**SuggestedRemedy**

Change "See IEEE 802.3 Clause 75, Clause 76 and Clause 77" to "See IEEE 802.3 Clause 75, Clause 76, and Clause 77"

**Response**                      **Response Status**    **C**

ACCEPT.

The TF and WG chairs rule that it is not a substantive change and the editor will use the editorial license to make this change.

**Cl 01**    **SC 1.4**                      **P20**            **L15**            # 2828  
Hajduczenia, Marek                      ZTE Corporation

**Comment Type**    **E**            **Comment Status**    **A**

Text reads "75, Clause 76, Clause 77)." which is inconsistent with line 11

**SuggestedRemedy**  
Change "75, Clause 76, Clause 77)." to read "75, Clause 76, and Clause 77)."

**Response**                      **Response Status**    **C**

ACCEPT.

The TF and WG chairs rule that it is not a substantive change and the editor will use the editorial license to make this change.

**Cl 01**    **SC 1.4**                      **P20**            **L21**            # 2841  
Hajduczenia, Marek                      ZTE Corporation

**Comment Type**    **E**            **Comment Status**    **A**

Text "in either one or both directions." would seem to allow to say that 10G-EPON can perate at 10Gb/s upstream only, which is not true. Text needs clarification

**SuggestedRemedy**  
Change "in either one or both directions." to "in either downstream or both downstream and upstream directions."

**Response**                      **Response Status**    **C**

ACCEPT.

The editor believes that, while this was submitted as an Editorial comment, it could be construed as a substantive change and is thus contrary to the motion, unanimously approved by the task force, to proceed to sponsor ballot. Therefore, using editorial license, this change will not be made at this time. The editor will resubmit this comment during sponsor ballot.

**Cl 01**    **SC 1.4**                      **P20**            **L22**            # 2882  
Kramer, Glen                              Teknovus, Inc.

**Comment Type**    **E**            **Comment Status**    **A**

definitions for 10/10G-EPON and 10/1G-EPON follow 10G-EPON

**SuggestedRemedy**  
"(see definitions above)" should be "(see definitions below)"

**Response**                      **Response Status**    **C**

ACCEPT.

The TF and WG chairs rule that it is not a substantive change and the editor will use the editorial license to make this change.

**Cl 01**    **SC 1.4**                      **P20**            **L28**            # 2829  
Hajduczenia, Marek                      ZTE Corporation

**Comment Type**    **E**            **Comment Status**    **R**

There is superfluous "data rate" hanging around without much need. If the value is expressed in "Gb/s", there is little doubt it is data rate.

**SuggestedRemedy**  
remove "data rate" in lines 18, 21, 24, 27

**Response**                      **Response Status**    **C**

REJECT.  
Task Force agrees with this resolution.  
Passed by Voice without opposition

Commenter agreed with this resolution.

1) It is noted that the Draft 2.2 document is technically correct and complete.  
2) The task force recognizes that the change suggested below would be an improvement and mandates the editor to resubmit this comment against draft D3.0. The editor shall provide the following proposed response:

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Cl 01**    **SC 1.4**                      **P20**            **L32**            # 2842  
Hajduczenia, Marek                      ZTE Corporation

**Comment Type**    **T**            **Comment Status**    **R**

"the static loss of light through (...)" reads funny. Light is not lost, its power is dissipated (lost). This needs some word-smithing

**SuggestedRemedy**  
Suggestion to change "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 EPON links, optional power splitter/combiner." to read "static attenuation of optical carrier power level, observed between transmitter and receiver, resulting in particular from the presence of fiber, connectors, and splices as well as - in case of PON links - optional power splitter(s)/combiner(s)."

**Response**                      **Response Status**    **C**

REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

I believe the term "loss of light", often used in reference to fiber optic systems for the last 20 years, is well understood.

Cl 01 SC 1.5 P20 L 54 # 2856  
Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type E Comment Status A

Distributed Feedback Laser (abbreviation is used in 67A.3 and 75.5.1)

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change to  
distributed feedback (no capitals, no 'laser')

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

The editor believes that, while this was submitted as an Editorial comment, it could be construed as a substantive change and is thus contrary to the motion, unanimously approved by the task force, to proceed to sponsor ballot. Therefore, using editorial license, this change will not be made at this time. The editor will resubmit this comment during sponsor ballot.

Cl 01 SC 1.5 P21 L 6 # 2855  
Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type E Comment Status A

Time Division Multiple Access  
Wavelength Division Multiplexing

*SuggestedRemedy*

time division multiple access  
wavelength division multiplexing

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

The TF and WG chairs rule that it is not a substantive change and the editor will use the editorial license to make this change.

Cl 30 SC 30.3.2.1.2 P26 L 12 # 2843  
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corporation

Comment Type T Comment Status R

"10/1GBASE-PRX Clause 76 10/1G-EPON 10 Gb/s 64B/66B with 1 Gb/s 8B/10B" - someone reading this may think we use both coding schemes in the same data path. This needs some clarification

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change "10/1GBASE-PRX Clause 76 10/1G-EPON 10 Gb/s 64B/66B with 1 Gb/s 8B/10B" to read "10/1GBASE-PRX Clause 76 10/1G-EPON 10 Gb/s 64B/66B downstream and 1 Gb/s 8B/10B upstream". The same for line 19

Response Response Status C

REJECT.  
Task Force agrees with this resolution.  
Passed by Voice without opposition

Commenter agreed with this resolution.

- 1) It is noted that the Draft 2.2 document is technically correct and complete.
- 2) The task force recognizes that the change suggested below would be an improvement and mandates the editor to resubmit this comment against draft D3.0. The editor shall provide the following proposed response:

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 30 SC 30.3.5.1.4 P26 L 45 # 2830  
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corporation

Comment Type E Comment Status A

Text "specified in 65.1.2.3.265.1.3.2.2 or 76.2.6.1.3.2 as appropriate.;" is missing a comma.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change "specified in 65.1.2.3.265.1.3.2.2 or 76.2.6.1.3.2 as appropriate.;" to "specified in 65.1.2.3.265.1.3.2.2 or 76.2.6.1.3.2, as appropriate.;"

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The TF and WG chairs rule that it is not a substantive change and the editor will use the editorial license to make this change.

Change to  
add comma and spell appropriate correctly:  
"specified in 65.1.3.2.2 or 76.2.6.1.3.2, as appropriate.;"

**Cl 30**    **SC 30.3.7.1.7**                      **P27**            **L37**            # **2831**  
Hajduczenia, Marek                              ZTE Corporation

**Comment Type**    **E**                      **Comment Status**    **A**                      *UnCngTxt-OOS*

Plural "frames" is used though verbs indicate singular noun. Align verb forms to what is used in 30.3.7.1.6

*SuggestedRemedy*  
Change "passes the CRC-8" to "pass the CRC-8"  
Change "and the frame meets the" to "and meet the"

**Response**                                      **Response Status**    **C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The TF and WG chairs rule that it is not a substantive change and the editor will use the editorial license to make this change.

[comment is against the unchanged text and outside the scope of this ballot]

Change "passes the CRC-8" to "and that pass the CRC-8"  
Change "and the frame meets the" to "and meet the"

**Cl 31A**    **SC 31A**                                      **P17**            **L1**            # **201919**  
Dawe, Piers    Avago

**Comment Type**    **TR**                      **Comment Status**    **R**                      *PAR scope*

The proposed 31A and 31C have nothing to do with the objectives

*SuggestedRemedy*  
Remove the material related to MAC Control EXTENSION to a separate draft. Prepare objective(s) for it, or decide to abandon it, or let 802.3 or another study group or task force address the question.

**Response**                                      **Response Status**    **U**

REJECT.  
802.3 considered it and chartered 802.3av TF to implement it as "a service to humanity". This mechanism was added by directive of the 802.3 WG - please see motion number #3 in minutes\_0708.pdf."

**Cl 31A**    **SC 31A**                                      **P31**            **L31**            # **2857**  
Dawe, Piers    Avago Technologies

**Comment Type**    **E**                      **Comment Status**    **A**                      *UnCngTxt-OOS*

Hexadecimal

*SuggestedRemedy*  
hexadecimal

**Response**                                      **Response Status**    **C**

ACCEPT.

The TF and WG chairs rule that it is not a substantive change and the editor will use the editorial license to make this change.

[comment is against the unchanged text and outside the scope of this ballot]

**Cl 31A**    **SC 31A**                                      **P33**            **L8**            # **2864**  
Dawe, Piers    Avago Technologies

**Comment Type**    **T**                      **Comment Status**    **R**                      *UnCngTxt-OOS*

In line with the improvements to 31C, this table can be more specific.

*SuggestedRemedy*  
Change '24 bits' to '00-19-A7'.

**Response**                                      **Response Status**    **C**

REJECT.  
[Page and line number was fixed, was against 31/40]

802.3 considered the MAC Control Extension mechanism and chartered 802.3av TF to implement it as "a service to humanity". This mechanism was added by directive of the 802.3 WG - please see motion number #3 in minutes\_0708.pdf.

For that reason, the Task Force prefers to consult 802.3 on this matter. The comment is being rejected now and the commenter is encouraged to submit it against the later draft so that it can be discussed at the March Opening Session.

Please also note that the comment is out of scope since it is made against unchanged text.

Cl 31A SC 31A.1 P17 L12 # 201915  
Dawe, Piers Avago

Comment Type TR Comment Status R

"31.1 Overview says ""Non-realtime, or quasistatic control (e.g., configuration of MAC operational parameters) is provided by Layer Management."" The new 31A and 31C appears to be an attempt to overturn that, and not restricted to PON."

SuggestedRemedy

Needs proper debate in 802.3. If we agree that we want to do go ahead, the sentence quoted would need changing.

Response Response Status U

REJECT.  
[Subclause number was fixed]  
[Page number was fixed]  
Annex 31A and 31C are not an attempt to overturn that "Non-realtime, or quasistatic control". It will be used for real-time control.  
This mechanism was added by directive of the 802.3 WG - please see motion number #3 in minutes\_0708.pdf."

Cl 31C SC 31C.3.1 P33 L6 # 2850  
Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type TR Comment Status R Control Client UnCngTxt-OOS

Draft says 'Upon reception of EXTENSION frames, the frame is sent to the MAC CONTROL client.' So there is only one MAC CONTROL client. I doubt that you want the EXTENSION frames to go to the same client as the ordinary Ethernet frames. Note unsatisfied TRs in this area.

SuggestedRemedy

Change 'the MAC CONTROL client' to wherever you want these frames to go. One could call it 'the MAC Control organization specific extension client'.

Response Response Status W

REJECT.

The WG chair rules that this comment is out of scope not requiring recirculation.

The MAC Control Client is outside of the scope of 802.3 standard; the standard does not restrict MAC Control Client from including multiple functions. In fact currently MAC Control Clients already include multiple functions, such as flow control, MPCP discovery client, etc. A new MAC Control Client can also include functionality necessary to handle EXTENSION messages. No changes to the draft are needed.

The comment does not require recirculation for the following reasons:

- 1) It was submitted by a balloter who voted "Disapprove" on the previous ballot, thus the balloter's vote does not change.
- 2) The comment restates comments #2709 & #2710 from draft D2.1 ballot, which was submitted by the same balloter, and rejected. It can therefore be considered a "pile on" to the balloter's own comment.
- 3) The comment is made against text which did not change between D2.1 and D2.2 (i.e. did not change in the recirculated draft).



**Cl 31C**    **SC 31C.3.1**                      **P33**            **L 6**                      # 212710  
Dawe, Piers                                      Avago Technologies

**Comment Type**    **TR**            **Comment Status**    **R**                      **TENSION MAC Control Client**

Draft says 'Upon reception of EXTENSION frames, the frame is sent to the MAC CONTROL client.' 31.2 says 'MAC Control clients may include the Bridge Relay Entity, LLC, or other applications.' I don't believe the intended recipient is Bridge Relay Entity, LLC, or the other applications imagined in the base standard. Note unsatisfied TRs in this area.

**SuggestedRemedy**

Change 'the MAC CONTROL client' to wherever you want these frames to go. One could call it 'the MAC Control organization specific extension client' and add another sentence to 31C.1 'The intended client for the MAC Control organization specific extension is an OMCI? remote management subsystem (see ITU-T G.984 and G.983?).'

**Response**                                      **Response Status**    **U**

REJECT.  
OMCI fits perfectly into the category of "other applications". No changes to the draft are believed to be needed.

**Cl 45**    **SC 45.2.1**                      **P39**            **L 43**                      # 2858  
Dawe, Piers                                      Avago Technologies

**Comment Type**    **E**                      **Comment Status**    **R**

Thanks for adding the third column in Table 45-3. I wasn't clear enough in describing how it is used in P802.3ba: it's to allow the reader to click to the definition of the register concerned.

**SuggestedRemedy**

Please change '75' to a clickable '45.2.1.11'.

**Response**                                      **Response Status**    **C**

REJECT.  
Task Force agrees with this resolution.  
Passed by Voice without opposition  
In room: 17

Commenter agreed with this resolution.

- 1) It is noted that the Draft 2.2 document is technically correct and complete.
- 2) The task force recognizes that the change suggested below would be an improvement and mandates the editor to resubmit this comment against draft D3.0. The editor shall provide the following proposed response:

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Cl 45**    **SC 45.2.1.6**                      **P40**            **L 29**                      # 2859  
Dawe, Piers                                      Avago Technologies

**Comment Type**    **E**                      **Comment Status**    **A**

Unwanted '>', order

**SuggestedRemedy**

Change  
Change Table 45-7 as shown below  
45.2.1.6> PMA/PMD control 2 register (Register 1.7)  
to  
45.2.1.6 PMA/PMD control 2 register (Register 1.7)  
Change Table 45-7 as shown below

**Response**                                      **Response Status**    **C**

ACCEPT.

The TF and WG chairs rule that it is not a substantive change and the editor will use the editorial license to make this change.

Fix the typo!!!!

Cl 45 SC 45.2.1.6.1 P44 L46 # 2862  
Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type T Comment Status R

Need to update 45.2.1.6.1 PMA/PMD type selection (1.7.3:0) because you have changed from the former 4-bit PMA/PMD type selection to 5-bit PMA/PMD type selection.

SuggestedRemedy

Show revision of 45.2.1.6.1 PMA/PMD type selection (1.7.3:0)  
The PMA/PMD type of the PMA/PMD shall be selected using bits 3 through 0.  
to 45.2.1.6.1 PMA/PMD type selection (1.7.4:0)  
The PMA/PMD type of the PMA/PMD shall be selected using bits 4 to 0.

Response Response Status C

REJECT.  
Task Force agrees with this resolution.  
For: 14  
Against: 0  
Abstain: 0  
Motion Passes  
In room: 16

Commenter agreed with this resolution.

- 1) The above comment is made against unchanged text and therefore out of scope for this ballot.
- 2) The task force mandates the editor to resubmit this comment against draft D3.0. The editor shall provide the following proposed response:

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 45 SC 45.2.3.29 P45 L47 # 2796  
Mandin, Jeff PMC Sierra

Comment Type E Comment Status R

wordsmithing/consistency

SuggestedRemedy

Change:  
  
"This bit indicates that the PCS supports ...."  
  
to  
  
"A read of 1 in this bit indicates that the PCS supports ...."

Response Response Status C

REJECT.  
Task Force agrees with this resolution.  
Passed by Voice without opposition  
In room: 16

Commenter agreed with this resolution.

- 1) It is noted that the Draft 2.2 document is technically correct and complete.
- 2) The task force recognizes that the change suggested below would be an improvement and mandates the editor to resubmit this comment against draft D3.0. The editor shall provide the following proposed response:

PROPOSED  
ACCEPT.

*Cl* 45    *SC* 45.2.3.29    *P*45    *L*48    # 2797  
Mandin, Jeff    PMC Sierra

*Comment Type*    **E**    *Comment Status*    **R**  
wordsmithing

*SuggestedRemedy*  
Change:  
"(mandatory for 10/1GBASE-PRX or 10GBASE-PR)"  
to  
"(always reads as 1 for 10/1GBASE-PRX or 10GBASE-PR)"

*Response*    *Response Status*    **C**  
REJECT.  
Task Force agrees with this resolution.  
Passed by Voice without opposition  
In room: 16

Commenter agreed with this resolution.

1) It is noted that the Draft 2.2 document is technically correct and complete.  
2) The task force recognizes that the change suggested below would be an improvement and mandates the editor to resubmit this comment against draft D3.0. The editor shall provide the following proposed response:  
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

*Cl* 45    *SC* 45.2.3.29.2    *P*46    *L*10    # 2844  
Hajduczenia, Marek    ZTE Corporation

*Comment Type*    **T**    *Comment Status*    **R**    *UnCngTxt-OOS*

Text reads "This bit indicates that the 10GBASE-PR PCS or the downstream transmitter/receiver component of the 10/1GBASE-PRX supports 10 Gb/s forward error correction." which can be read as indicating that in 10/1GBASE-PRX-D PCS, receive path uses RS(255,223), which is not true. Needs some clarification.

*SuggestedRemedy*  
Change  
"This bit indicates that the 10GBASE-PR PCS or the downstream transmitter/receiver component of the 10/1GBASE-PRX supports 10 Gb/s forward error correction."  
to  
"This bit indicates that the 10GBASE-PR PCS or the transmit path in the 10/1GBASE-PRX OLT PCS and the receive path in 10/1GBASE-PRX ONU PCS support 10 Gb/s forward error correction."

*Response*    *Response Status*    **C**  
REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

[comment is against the unchanged text and outside the scope of this ballot]

**Cl 45**    **SC 45.2.3.30.2**    **P47**    **L1**    # **2799**  
Mandin, Jeff    PMC Sierra

**Comment Type E**    **Comment Status R**    *UnCngTxt-OOS*

wordsmithing + incorrect reference

**SuggestedRemedy**  
Change

"The register describing ability to enable forward error correction in the 10/1GBASE-PRX upstream is specified in 45.2.7.3"

to

"The register for enabling and disabling forward error correction in the 10/1GBASE-PRX upstream is specified in 45.2.8.3"

**Response**    **Response Status C**

REJECT.  
Task Force agrees with this resolution.  
Passed by Voice without opposition  
In room: 16

Commenter agreed with this resolution.

1) It is noted that the Draft 2.2 document is technically correct and complete.  
2) The above comment is made against unchanged text and therefore out of scope for this ballot.  
3) The task force recognizes that the change suggested below would be an improvement and mandates the editor to resubmit this comment against draft D3.0. The editor shall provide the following proposed response:

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Cl 56**    **SC 56.1**    **P34**    **L19**    # **202418**  
DIAB, WAEL    BROADCOM

**Comment Type ER**    **Comment Status A**    *See#2274*

Two different styles are used to reference the 1Gb/s and 10G EPON systems. Please make consistant

**SuggestedRemedy**  
Change 10G-EPON to 10Gb/s EPON

**Response**    **Response Status C**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
Draft is revised and consistent notation is used per comment #971 from March 2008 (see 3av\_D2\_1\_markup.pdf, Clause 1.5).

**Cl 56**    **SC 56.1**    **P53**    **L1**    # **2832**  
Hajduczenia, Marek    ZTE Corporation

**Comment Type E**    **Comment Status R**

Layer architecture figures (56-1, 56-2, 56-3, 75-1, 75-2, 76-1, 76-2, 77-2 and 77-3) need two updates:  
(1) align with official requirements for such figures if published by the Chair of 802.3  
(2) per comment from Dallas meeting from dr. Lin (#2766), it was proposed to replace in all aforementioned figures the block "Optical distributor combiner(s)" with "Optical splitter(s)/combiner(s)"

**SuggestedRemedy**  
Per comment

**Response**    **Response Status C**

REJECT.  
Figure is OK as is - very minor wordsmithing not required.

Cl 56 SC 56.1.2 P56 L 20 # 2792  
Mandin, Jeff PMC Sierra

Comment Type E Comment Status R UnCngTxt-OOS  
Incorrect PHY name and clause references.

## SuggestedRemedy

Change:

"The P2MP PHYs for the 10/10G-EPON use the 10GBASE-PR PCS (see Clause 75) and PMA (see Clause 76). The P2MP PHYs for 10/1G-EPON use the 10GBASE-PR PCS and PMA for the downstream direction (see Clause 75 and Clause 76 respectively) and 1000BASE-X PCS (see Clause 65) for the upstream direction."

to:

"The P2MP PHYs for the 10/10G-EPON use the 10GBASE-PR PCS and PMA (see Clause 76). The P2MP PHYs for 10/1G-EPON use the 10GBASE-PRX PCS and PMA (see Clause 76)"

Response Response Status C

REJECT.  
Task Force agrees with this resolution.  
Passed by Voice without opposition  
In room: 16

Commenter agreed with this resolution.

- 1) It is noted that the Draft 2.2 document is technically correct and complete.
- 2) The above comment is made against unchanged text and therefore out of scope for this ballot.
- 3) The task force recognizes that the change suggested below would be an improvement and mandates the editor to resubmit this comment against draft D3.0. The editor shall provide the following proposed response:

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 56 SC 56.1.2.2 P56 L 49 # 2833  
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corporation

Comment Type E Comment Status R  
"The MPCP achieves this by" - "the" is not needed. remove it

## SuggestedRemedy

Per comment

Response Response Status C

REJECT.  
The sentence reads better with the article.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general  
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn  
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

Cl 56 SC 56.1.3 P57 L 4 # 2794  
Mandin, Jeff PMC Sierra

Comment Type E Comment Status R  
Wordsmithing

## SuggestedRemedy

Change:

"Additionally, EFM introduces a family of Physical Layer signaling systems which are derived from 10GBASE-R, but which include a 10GBASE-PR RS, PCS and PMA adapted for 10G-EPON, along with a mandatory FEC capability, as defined in Clause 76."

to:

"Additionally, EFM introduces a family of Physical Layer signaling systems which are derived from 10GBASE-R, but which include RS, PCS and PMA sublayers adapted for 10G-EPON, along with a mandatory FEC capability, as defined in Clause 76."

Response Response Status C

REJECT.  
Task Force agrees with this resolution.  
Passed by Voice without opposition  
In room: 16

Commenter agreed with this resolution.

- 1) It is noted that the Draft 2.2 document is technically correct and complete.
- 2) The task force recognizes that the change suggested below would be an improvement and mandates the editor to resubmit this comment against draft D3.0. The editor shall provide the following proposed response:

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Cl 56**    **SC 56.1.3**    **P57**    **L7**    # **2795**  
Mandin, Jeff    PMC Sierra

**Comment Type E**    **Comment Status R**    *UnCngTxt-OOS*  
Terminology

*SuggestedRemedy*  
Change:

"The family of P2MP Physical Layer signaling systems utilizes 10GBASE-R signaling for the downstream direction while supporting both 10GBASE-R and 1000BASE-X upstream signaling in the following series of PMD combinations:"

to

"The family of P2MP Physical Layer signaling systems utilizes 10 Gb/s signaling for the downstream direction while supporting both 10 Gb/s and 1 Gb/s upstream signaling in the following series of PMD combinations:"

**Response**    **Response Status C**  
REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

[comment is against the unchanged text and outside the scope of this ballot]

**Cl 56**    **SC 56.1.3**    **P58**    **L24**    # **2884**  
Kramer, Glen    Teknovus, Inc.

**Comment Type E**    **Comment Status R**  
Since several drafts ago we have removed units from "Rate" column header, all entries in this column should have units added to them.

*SuggestedRemedy*  
Add "Mb/s" to rate for 10PASS-TS and 2BASE-TL

**Response**    **Response Status C**  
REJECT.  
Task Force agrees with this resolution.  
Passed by Voice without opposition  
In room: 16

Commenter agreed with this resolution.

- 1) It is noted that the Draft 2.2 document is technically correct and complete.
- 2) The task force recognizes that the change suggested below would be an improvement and mandates the editor to resubmit this comment against draft D3.0. The editor shall provide the following proposed response:

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Cl 66**    **SC 66.3**    **P61**    **L32**    # **2793**  
Mandin, Jeff    PMC Sierra

**Comment Type E**    **Comment Status R**  
In c66, "p2p" is used when P2MP is intended

*SuggestedRemedy*  
change P2P to P2MP in clause 66

Also in 56.1.2.2

**Response**    **Response Status C**  
REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

[Changed from proposed accept] subclause 66.3 was changed and "P2P" added to differentiate it from subclause 66.4, which was added.

**Cl 75**    **SC 75.1**                      **P67**            **L 28**                      # 2809  
 Lin, Rujian                                      Shanghai Luster Terab

**Comment Type**    **E**            **Comment Status**    **R**                      *UnCngTxt-OOS*  
 in either downstream or in both downstream and upstream directions

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Change to "in either downstream direction or both downstream and upstream directions"

**Response**                      **Response Status**    **C**  
 REJECT.  
 Original text reads fine.

[comment is against the unchanged text and outside the scope of this ballot]

**Cl 75**    **SC 75.1**                      **P69**            **L 428**                      # 2871  
 Frank , Chang                                      Vitesse

**Comment Type**    **T**            **Comment Status**    **R**  
 Suggest some changes in Table 75-1 to avoid ambiguity. Line 22 actually talking about nominal operating distance, not clear what >10km and >20km actually means?

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Change "Maximum reach" as "(nominal) operating distance", take out >=.  
 Maybe consider to add a footnote such as:  
 "...exceeds the operational range requirement while meeting all optical specifications and power budget is considered compliant."

(-2, +3) is confusing, suggest to change to wavelength range as 1570 to 1580.

**Response**                      **Response Status**    **C**  
 REJECT.  
 Task Force agrees with this resolution.  
 Passed by Voice without opposition

Commenter agreed with this resolution.

1) It is noted that the Draft 2.2 document is technically correct and complete.  
 2) The task force recognizes that the change suggested below would be an improvement and mandates the editor to resubmit this comment against draft D3.0. The editor shall provide the following proposed response:

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 TF has already discussed this idea and we agree that "maximum reach of >=10 km" is understandable.  
 A footnote can be added to "Maximum reach" parameter stating that "A compliant system may exceed maximum reach designed for given power budget as long as optical power budget and other mandatory optical layer specifications are met. "

**Cl 75**    **SC 75.2.1.1**                      **P72**            **L 37**                      # 2861  
 Dawe, Piers                                      Avago Technologies

**Comment Type**    **E**            **Comment Status**    **A**  
 pairings

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 pairings  
 Also in 75.2.1.2  
 Also add full stop after 'Table 75-1', line 53

**Response**                      **Response Status**    **C**  
 ACCEPT.

The TF and WG chairs rule that it is not a substantive change and the editor will use the editorial license to make this change.

**Cl 75**    **SC 75.3**                                      **P73**            **L 69**                      # 2867  
 Frank , Chang                                      Vitesse

**Comment Type**    **E**            **Comment Status**    **R**                      *UnCngTxt-OOS*  
 Add note in Table 75.2 regarding 10GBASE-PR-U2.

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 sth. like this: 10GBASE-PR-U2 is eliminated as assumed the same as 10GBASE-PR-U1.

**Response**                      **Response Status**    **C**  
 REJECT.  
 No need, there is no 10GBASE-PR-U2 at all so nothing was eliminated. It is clear from the power budget - PMD mapping that 10GBASE-PR-U1 is used by two power budgets (PR10 and PR20).

[comment is against the unchanged text and outside the scope of this ballot]

Cl 75 SC 75.3.2 P75 L 410 # 2872  
Frank, Chang Vitesse

Comment Type T Comment Status R UnCngTxt-OOS

feel not appropriate statement for PMD service if.

SuggestedRemedy

To be consistent with the existing practice, suggest the following change to replace line 4-6:

"All optical measurements for the compliance points shall be made through a short path cable, between 2m and 5m in length, unless otherwise specified.

The electrical specifications of the PMD service interface (TP1 and TP4 for the downstream channel and TP5 and TP8 for the upstream channel) could be defined as transceiver module compliance points into host ASIC systems."

Response Response Status C

REJECT.

Cable length is included by reference in 75.7.

"host ASIC system" is not defined in the scope of this standard. Current text in the draft unambiguously states that TP1, TP4, TP5 and TP8 are not mandatory compliance points, though it does not preclude certain implementations from making these points accessible.

No changes to the draft are needed.

[comment is against the unchanged text and outside the scope of this ballot]

Cl 75 SC 75.4 P90 L 36 # 212451  
SAEKI, NAOTO NEC Corporation

Comment Type TR Comment Status A

The downstream wavelength for PR10 and PR20 should not be changed without any discussion for power budget. Considering long history of discussion for PMD, especially wave length and power budget, in 802.3av TF, combination of power budget and wave length in D2.0 were the only solution for convergence of the discussion.

SuggestedRemedy

If wave length change is required, OLT transmitter launched power and ONU receiver sensitivity for PR20 should also be changed as below.

OLT transmitter average launched power: 2 to 5 dBm (same as PR30)

ONU receiver sensitivity (max): -28.5 dBm (same as PR30)

( related parameters will be also changed.)

In this solution, we can reduce the downstream PMD class. (from 3 to 2 classes)

In addition, we can use same ONU receiver for PR20 and 30 by changing condition of FEC.

(same receiver with FEC for PR30, without FEC for PR20)

Response Response Status U

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

[subclause number was fixed, was 4, is 75.4]

I approve the response (REJECT). Draft 2.1 remains as it is.

Yes: 15

No: 8

Abstain: 11

Motion fails

I approve the response ("AIP. See comment #2737 for resolution").

Yes: 27

No: 0

Abstain: 8

Comment is closed



CI 75 SC 75.4.1 P77 L 23 # 2790  
 Hamano, Hiroshi Fujitsu Labs. Ltd.

Comment Type E Comment Status R Table 75-6, PMD group issue

In the last Denver meeting, the number of Columns in Table 75-5 was reduced from three to two, combining PR-D1/PRX-D1 and PR-D3/PRX-D3, because those values are identical, while, in Table 75-6, PR-D2 and PR-D3 Columns still remain, although theirs are also identical.

It seems logical not to duplicate the column, indicating properly the commonality over classes. But it also seems confusing for readers to distinguish three power budget classes without seeing three Columns.

Additionally the texts, started with 'Note that there is only two groups...', are incorrect. The first group should be shared by D1 and D3, and the second group by D2.

#### SuggestedRemedy

Revive the old three-Column table for Table 75-5, and fill all the PR-D3/PRX-D3 values same as those of PR-D1/PRX-D1. Or, fill the PR-D3/PRX-D3 Column across with the text 'same as 10GBASE-PR-D1 and 10/1GBASE-PRX-D1 transmit parameters'.

Delete all the notes about 'two groups of transmit parameters' in Lines 22-25.

Table 75-6 and Table 75-11 should also be revisited.

Response Response Status C

REJECT.  
 Task Force agrees with this resolution.  
 Passed by Voice without opposition  
 In room: 16

Commenter agreed with this resolution.

- 1) It is noted that the Draft 2.2 document is technically correct and complete.
- 2) The above comment is made against unchanged text and therefore out of scope for this ballot.
- 3) The task force recognizes that the change suggested below would be an improvement and mandates the editor to resubmit this comment against draft D3.0. The editor shall provide the following proposed response:

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The Task Force feels that it is preferable to show multiple power classes in a single column to emphasize the cases where multiple power classes use identical parameters.

Combine 10GBASE-PR-D2 and 10GBASE-PR-D3 columns in Table 75-6 into a single one.

CI 75 SC 75.4.1 P77 L 23 # 2878  
 Tajima, Akio NEC Corporation

Comment Type E Comment Status R PMD group issue

The description of OLT PMDs is wrong.

#### SuggestedRemedy

Change "The first group is shared by 10GBASE.PR.D1, 10/1GBASE.PRX.D1, 10GBASE.PR.D2, and 10/1GBASE.PRX.D2. The second group is shared by 10GBASE.PR.D3 and 10/1GBASE.PRX.D3." to "The first group is shared by 10GBASE.PR.D1, 10/1GBASE.PRX.D1, 10GBASE.PR.D3, and 10/1GBASE.PRX.D3. The second group is shared by 10GBASE.PR.D2 and 10/1GBASE.PRX.D2."

Response Response Status C

REJECT.  
 Task Force agrees with this resolution.  
 Passed by Voice without opposition  
 In room: 15

Commenter agreed with this resolution.

- 1) It is noted that the Draft 2.2 document is technically correct and complete.
- 2) The task force recognizes that the change suggested below would be an improvement and mandates the editor to resubmit this comment against draft D3.0. The editor shall provide the following proposed response:

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

[Subclause number was fixed]

Change to "The first group is shared by 10GBASE-PR-D1, 10/1GBASE-PRX-D1, 10GBASE-PR-D3, and 10/1GBASE-PRX-D3. The second group is shared by 10GBASE-PR-D2 and 10/1GBASE-PRX-D2."

Cl 75 SC 75.4.1 P77 L 23 # 2846  
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corporation

Comment Type T Comment Status R PMD group issue

Text "The first group is shared by 10GBASE-PR-D1, 10/1GBASE-PRX-D1, 10GBASE-PR-D2, and 10/1GBASE-PRX-D2. The second group is shared by 10GBASE-PR-D3 and 10/1GBASE-PRX-D3." is not technically correct (not consistent with Table 75-5). Needs to be updated as below

SuggestedRemedy

Change it to "The first group is shared by 10GBASE-PR-D1, 10/1GBASE-PRX-D1, 10GBASE-PR-D3, and 10/1GBASE-PRX-D3. The second group is shared by 10GBASE-PR-D2 and 10/1GBASE-PRX-D2."

Response Response Status C

REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

See comment #2878.

Cl 75 SC 75.4.1 P77 L 2325 # 2820  
Lin, Rujian Shanghai Luster Terab

Comment Type T Comment Status R PMD group issue

The first group is shared by 10GBASE-PR-D1, 10/1GBASE-PRX-D1, 10GBASE-PR-D2, and 10GBASE-PRX-D2. The second group is shared by 10GBASE-PR-D3 and 10/1GBASE-PRX-D3

SuggestedRemedy

Change to "The first group is shared by 10GBASE-PR-D1, 10/1GBASE-PRX-D1, 10GBASE-PR-D3, and 10/1GBASE-PRX-D3. The second group is shared by 10GBASE-PR-D2 and 10/1GBASE-PRX-D2"

Response Response Status C

REJECT.

Task Force agrees with this resolution.  
Passed by Voice without opposition  
In room: 14

Commenter agreed with this resolution.

- 1) It is noted that the Draft 2.2 document is technically correct and complete.
- 2) The task force recognizes that the change suggested below would be an improvement and mandates the editor to resubmit this comment against draft D3.0. The editor shall provide the following proposed response:

PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
See comment #2878

Cl 75 SC 75.4.1 P77 L 35 # 2845  
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corporation

Comment Type T Comment Status R 1574-1575 issue

In table 75-5, "Wavelength (range)" is still defined as "1574 to 1580" and should be "1575 to 1580"

SuggestedRemedy

as per comment

Response Response Status C

REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

See comment #2821.

**Cl 75**    **SC 75.4.1**    **P77**    **L 35**    # 2821  
 Lin, Rujian    Shanghai Luster Terab

**Comment Type**    **T**    **Comment Status**    **R**    1574-1575 issue  
 In the 3rd row of Table 75-5, Wavelength (range) 1574 to 1580 nm

**SuggestedRemedy**

Change Wavelength(range) to "1575 to 1580" nm  
 The same change is applied to Table 75-11

**Response**    **Response Status**    **C**

REJECT.  
 Task Force agrees with this resolution.  
 Passed by Voice without opposition  
 In room: 14

Commenter agreed with this resolution.

- 1) It is noted that the Draft 2.2 document is technically correct and complete.
- 2) The task force recognizes that the change suggested below would be an improvement and mandates the editor to resubmit this comment against draft D3.0. The editor shall provide the following proposed response:

PROPOSED  
 ACCEPT.

**Cl 75**    **SC 75.4.1**    **P77**    **L 43**    # 2869  
 Frank , Chang    Vitesse

**Comment Type**    **T**    **Comment Status**    **R**    *Rounding, UnChngTxt\_OOS*  
 Suggest numbers are rounded to nearest 0.1. For important Tp2 or Tp6 interop points, I donot think "3.91dBm launching OMA" serve any better than 3.9dBm.

**SuggestedRemedy**

Suggest to change "3.91" to "3.9", while "6.91" to "6.9" in line 43.

May add one footnote: OMA numbers are rounded to nearest 0.1dB.

**Response**    **Response Status**    **C**

REJECT.

Number resulting from calculations are given with two decimal digit precision, as in Clause 60 e.g. -0.22 dBm in Table 60-3. Numbers specified in the draft are technically correct.

Comment is out of scope at this stage. Commenter is invited to resubmit this comment at the Sponsor Ballot stage.

**Cl 75**    **SC 75.4.2**    **P79**    **L 1**    # 2835  
 Hajduczenia, Marek    ZTE Corporation

**Comment Type**    **E**    **Comment Status**    **R**    *Table 75-6 UnCngTxt-OOS*  
 In table 75-6, there are 3 columns with PMD paramers, though 10GBASE-PR-D2 and 10GBASE-PR-D3 have them exactly the same. They can be collapsed as presented in 3av\_0901\_hajduczenia\_1.pdf

**SuggestedRemedy**

as per comment

**Response**    **Response Status**    **C**

REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

See comment #2790.

[comment is against the unchanged text and outside the scope of this ballot]

**Cl 75**    **SC 75.4.2**    **P79**    **L 531**    # 2870  
 Frank , Chang    Vitesse

**Comment Type**    **T**    **Comment Status**    **R**    *Rounding, UnChngTxt\_OOS*  
 Suggest numbers are rounded to nearest 0.1 in Table 75-6, 75-7.

Seems alot of changes, I will provide slides for both tables.

Also table 75-8, 75-9, 75-11.

**SuggestedRemedy**

**Response**    **Response Status**    **C**

REJECT.  
 [Page number was changed, was against 79-82]

See response to comment #2869.

Comment is out of scope at this stage. Commenter is invited to resubmit this comment at the Sponsor Ballot stage.

Cl 75 SC 75.6 P85 L 34 # 2791  
Hamano, Hiroshi Fujitsu Labs. Ltd.

Comment Type E Comment Status R

The texts in Subclause 75.6.1 and 75.6.2 describe that the word 'downstream' or 'upstream' is not only a direction indicator, but is a part of the name for a specific function, such as 'the downstream dual-rate operation' or 'the upstream dual-rate operation', which can be enabled.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete 'Direction of' from the first cell in Table 75-12.

Response Response Status C

REJECT.

The Task Force believes the use of term "Direction of" in cell (1:1) in Table 75-12 is clear and does not need revision.

Cl 75 SC 75.6.1.2 P71 L 37 # 202406  
Law, David 3Com

Comment Type TR Comment Status A dual-rate term

It is very confusing to use the term 'dual-rate' operation to mean something other than 10/1Gb/s operation supported by 10/1GBASE-PRX PHYs. What is described here seems instead to be dual-mode operation - or coexistence of EPON and 10GEAPON - although it is not clear if dual-rate refers to [a] the coexistence of 10GBASE-PR and 10/1GBASE-PRX, [b] the coexistence of 10GBASE-PRX with 1000BASE-PX, [c] 10/1GBASE-PRX and 1000BASE-PX or [d] any of the above.

Also it is not clear why it has to be stated that TDMA techniques have to be used specifically in the case of coexistence to avoid collisions since, as far as I understood, TDMA always has to be used in PONs to avoid collisions.

Finally the term channel is used to refer to the Fibre optic cable plant - see for example Figure 75-3 and Table 75-1 (channel insertion loss).

SuggestedRemedy

Change the text 'An OLT supporting both upstream channels must use TDMA techniques to avoid collisions between transmissions originating from different ONUs, resulting in a dual-rate, burst mode transmission as discussed in Subclause 75.7.' to read 'For implementation information related to an OLT that supports both upstream wavebands see subclause 75.7.'. The details of the coexistence should be described in that subclause.

Elsewhere in the draft change 'dual-rate' to read 'coexistence'.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Where appropriate replace term "channel" with "data rate".

In the draft, 10/1GBASE-PRX is referred to as "asymmetric-rate" PHY. The term "dual-rate" is exclusively reserved for OLT Rx being able to receive 10G and 1G signals. TF believes that term "dual rate" is more specific than term "coexistence" and should be retained.

Implement together with #2373 and #2347.

**Cl 75**    **SC 75.7.10**    **P89**    **L 28**    # **2822**  
 Lin, Rujian    Shanghai Luster Terab

**Comment Type**    **T**    **Comment Status**    **R**

TDP measurement tests transmitter impairments caused by chromatic dispersion effects due to signal propagation in SMF used in PON. Possible causes of impairment in clude intersymbol interference, jitter, and RIN. Meeting the separate requirements (e.g. eye mask, spectral characteristics) does not in itself guarantee the transmitter and dispersion penalty (TDP).

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Modified to "TDP measurement tests PON system impairments caused by joint effects of transmitter characteristics and chromatic dispersion due to optical signal propagation in SMF used in PON. Possible causes of impairment include intersymbol interference, mode partitioning noise, jitter, and RIN. Meeting the separate requirements (e.g. transmitter eye mask, spectral characteristics) does not in itself guarantee the transmitter and dispersion penalty (TDP)."

**Response**    **Response Status**    **C**  
 REJECT.  
 [Line number was changed, was "2831"]

**Cl 75**    **SC 75.7.12**    **P89**    **L 42**    # **2874**  
 Frank , Chang    Vitesse

**Comment Type**    **T**    **Comment Status**    **R**    *UnCngTxt-OOS*

Compliance with SRS is specified as mandatory, but feel hard to follow such short note as described in "75.7.12 Stressed receiver conformance test".

I reviewed 802.3ah 58.7.11 for 1G PHY and 802.3ae 52.9.9 for 10G PHY, this may be possibly applicable to downstream directly, difficult and confusing for upstream. (So far I have not seen anybody follow this from published papers.)

Also FEC is mandatory, to test SRS for module alone at BER=1E-3 is pretty challenging.

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 ???

1) Remove "mandatory" for US?

2) another option is to specify RX testing methodology based on two ONUs (TX). I can provide slides for that.

**Response**    **Response Status**    **C**  
 REJECT.  
 There is neither consistent suggested remedy nor slides to go with this comment.

[comment is against the unchanged text and outside the scope of this ballot]

**Cl 75**    **SC 75.7.15**    **P90**    **L 1718**    # **2810**  
 Lin, Rujian    Shanghai Luster Terab

**Comment Type**    **E**    **Comment Status**    **A**

b) Treceiver\_settling is defined in 60.7.13.2.1 and its value is defined in Table 75-6 and Table 75-7.  
 c) TCDR is defined in 76.4.21, and its value less than 400 ns.

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 b) Treceiver\_settling is defined in 60.7.13.2.1, and its value is defined in Table 75-6 and Table 75-7.  
 c) TCDR is defined in 76.4.21, and its value is less than 400 ns.

**Response**    **Response Status**    **C**  
 ACCEPT.

The TF and WG chairs rule that it is not a substantive change and the editor will use the editorial license to make this change.

**Cl 75**    **SC 75.7.16**    **P90**    **L 23**    # **2876**  
 Frank , Chang    Vitesse

**Comment Type**    **T**    **Comment Status**    **R**    *UnCngTxt-OOS*

10G-EPON burst mode including RX settling and CDR locking should indicate the preamble patterns.

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Suggest to revisit 0x55 as preamble patern (refer to 3av\_0805\_effenbergger\_3)

**Response**    **Response Status**    **C**  
 REJECT.

[comment is against the unchanged text and outside the scope of this ballot]

Topic was visited, discussed, voted on and closed.

**Cl 75**    **SC 75.7.2**                      **P86**                      **L 3542**                      # **2873**  
 Frank , Chang                                      Vitesse

**Comment Type**    **T**                      **Comment Status**    **R**                      *UnCngTxt-OOS*

confusing. I assume "75.7.2 Allocation for penalties in 10G-EPON PMDs" should call to explain the numbers we enter into line 18 of Table 75B-1.

*SuggestedRemedy*

**Response**                                      **Response Status**    **C**

REJECT.

Comment is out of scope at this stage. Commenter is invited to resubmit this comment at the Sponsor Ballot stage.

**Cl 75B**    **SC 75B.2.1**                      **P107**                      **L 38**                      # **2847**  
 Hajduczenia, Marek                                      ZTE Corporation

**Comment Type**    **T**                      **Comment Status**    **R**                      *1574-1575 issue*

"The 10 Gb/s downstream transmission uses the 1574 - 1580 nm wavelength band, as specified in Clause 75." is incorrect. Change as proposed below

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change to "The 10 Gb/s downstream transmission uses the 1575 - 1580 nm wavelength band, as specified in Clause 75."

**Response**                                      **Response Status**    **C**

REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

**Cl 75B**    **SC 75B.2.1**                      **P107**                      **L 38**                      # **2811**  
 Lin, Rujian    Shanghai Luster Terab

**Comment Type**    **T**                      **Comment Status**    **R**                      *1574-1575 issue*

The 10 Gb/s downstream transmission uses 1574-1580 nm.....

*SuggestedRemedy*

The 10 Gb/s downstream transmission uses 1575-1580 nm.....

**Response**                                      **Response Status**    **C**

REJECT.  
 Task Force agrees with this resolution.  
 Fail/Passed by Voice without opposition  
 In room: 15

Commenter agreed with this resolution.

1) It is noted that the Draft 2.2 document is technically correct and complete.  
 2) The above comment is made against unchanged text and therefore out of scope for this ballot.  
 3) The task force recognizes that the change suggested below would be an improvement and mandates the editor to resubmit this comment against draft D3.0. The editor shall provide the following proposed response:

PROPOSED  
 ACCEPT.  
 [Was "E", changed to "T"]  
 [Changed Clause from "Annex" to "75B"]  
 See comment #2874

Cl 75B SC 75B.2.1 P108 L1 # 2848  
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corporation

Comment Type T Comment Status R UnCngTxt-OOS

Table 75B-1 and 75B-2 would be more complete if it was explained like in Table 75-14 that "Other fiber types are acceptable if the resulting ODN meets channel insertion loss and dispersion requirements.". Otherwise, it seems we redefeine requirements for fiber in two different places in two different ways.

SuggestedRemedy

Add footnote "Other fiber types are acceptable if the resulting ODN meets channel insertion loss and dispersion requirements." to parameter name "Fiber type" in Table 75B-1 and 75B-2

Response Response Status C

REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

[comment is against the unchanged text and outside the scope of this ballot]

Cl 75C SC 75C.1 P112 L112 # 2812  
Lin, Rujian Shanghai Luster Terab

Comment Type E Comment Status R

The location of Figure 75c-1 is improper.

SuggestedRemedy

Move the location of Figure 75C-1 down below Table 75C-3 and above Table 75C-4.

Response Response Status C

REJECT.

[Changed Clause from "Annex" to "75C"]

This will be fixed in a later draft under editorial license.

Cl 76 SC 76.2.1 P115 L48 # 2800  
Mandin, Jeff PMC Sierra

Comment Type E Comment Status R

Clause 65 defines the RS, PCS, and PMA for 1G.

It's not the case that the RS for 10G-EPON subclause (76.2) "extends" clause 65. Though 76.2 does incorporate the P2MP preamble from clause 65.

It's probably OK to just delete the reference to cl65.

SuggestedRemedy

Change:

"This subclause extends Clause 46 to enable multiple data link layers to interface with a single physical layer and Clause 65 to enable 10/1G-EPON data links, transmitting at one data rate (e.g. 10 Gb/s) and receive at another data rate (e.g. 1 Gb/s)."

to:

"This subclause extends Clause 46 to enable multiple data link layers to interface with a single physical layer, and to enable data links which transmit at one data rate (e.g. 10 Gb/s) and receive at another data rate (e.g. 1 Gb/s)."

Response Response Status C

REJECT.

Task Force agrees with this resolution.  
Passed by Voice without opposition  
In room: 15

Commenter agreed with this resolution.

- 1) It is noted that the Draft 2.2 document is technically correct and complete.
- 2) The task force recognizes that the change suggested below would be an improvement and mandates the editor to resubmit this comment against draft D3.0. The editor shall provide the following proposed response:

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 76 SC 76.2.1.3 P162 L37 # 212712  
 Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type TR Comment Status R C Code

"Draft says 'Code examples given in this clause adhere to the style of the ""C"" programming language.' This is a particularly bad choice, because C is notorious for being too cryptic and compact. D2.0 comment 1962 pointed out that the standard is supposed to be written in English, or state machine notation, or, only when desperate, specified programming languages with references so that the reader can find what the syntax actually means (Pascal and Matlab have been used and are MUCH more readable), and that code should if possible be executable by a machine."

*SuggestedRemedy*

Be sure that you state anything the reader needs to know, preferably in words, failing that in state diagrams, Pascal or Matlab. Avoid short fragments. Say which takes precedence if English and pseudo-code disagree.

Response Response Status U

REJECT.

- 1) The task force pays strong attention to clarity and readability of the produced draft.
- 2) Many studies show that today, programming language "C" is the most popular language. For example, see <http://www.langpop.com/>
- 3) C-style notation was adopted by many other programming environments, for example, Verilog. The TF believes that the C-style notation would be easiest to understand to a largest fraction of potential standard users.
- 4) Pascal was developed in 1968 and its popularity peaked around 1980. Since then, both popularity and user base of Pascal has been continuously shrinking. Today, Pascal's popularity is far behind C. In fact, studies show it to be in the same category with languages like Delphi, Ada, Scheme. Again, please, refer to <http://www.langpop.com/>.
- 5) Pascal programming language is no longer a mandatory course in computer science curriculum (for about 10-15 years now) while C programming language is widely studied. Pascal constructs today may appear unclear and confusing to many engineers who graduated in the past decade.
- 6) The IEEE Style Manual places no requirements of which programming language to use.
- 7) The task force believes that the draft development should reflect objective realities of technology development and evolution. Continued use of Pascal language in the draft will make a negative impression on potential users of the standard. The standard may unnecessarily be perceived as obsolete, not being in sync with modern technologies, and may turn potential users to use alternative standards developed by other SDOs.
- 8) Use of "C" language is consistent with code examples given in other projects for example see clause 61A.3.

Cl 76 SC 76.2.2 P119 L4 # 2849  
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corporation

Comment Type T Comment Status R UnCngTxt-OOS

Text reads "For 10G-EPON architectures, the XGMII is the interface used to transfer data between the MAC and the PHY." is not true since 10G-EPON also has GMII as per definitions in Clause 1.4

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change to read "For 10/10G-EPON architectures, the XGMII is the interface used to transfer data between the MAC and the PHY."

Response Response Status C

REJECT.

Task Force agrees with this resolution.  
 Passed by Voice without opposition  
 In room: 16

Commenter agreed with this resolution.

- 1) It is noted that the Draft 2.2 document is technically correct and complete.
- 2) The above comment is made against unchanged text and therefore out of scope for this ballot.
- 3) The task force recognizes that the change suggested below would be an improvement and mandates the editor to resubmit this comment against draft D3.0. The editor shall provide the following proposed response:

PROPOSED ACCEPT.



**Cl 76**      **SC 76.2.2.3**                      **P120**      **L1**                      # **2836**  
 Hajduczenia, Marek                      ZTE Corporation

**Comment Type**    **E**                      **Comment Status**    **R**                      **UnCngTxt-OOS**

Figure 76-3 needs minor changes. we still use 10/10 Gb/s and 10/1 Gb/s. Change as proposed below

**SuggestedRemedy**

Change "10/10 Gb/s" to "10/10G-EPON"  
 Change "10/1 Gb/s" to "10/1G-EPON"

**Response**                      **Response Status**    **C**

REJECT.  
 Task Force agrees with this resolution.  
 Passed by Voice without opposition  
 In room: 16

Commenter agreed with this resolution.

- 1) It is noted that the Draft 2.2 document is technically correct and complete.
- 2) The above comment is made against unchanged text and therefore out of scope for this ballot.
- 3) The task force recognizes that the change suggested below would be an improvement and mandates the editor to resubmit this comment against draft D3.0. The editor shall provide the following proposed response:

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Cl 76**      **SC 76.2.2.5.3**                      **P120**      **L1**                      # **201962**  
 Dawe, Piers                      Avago

**Comment Type**    **TR**                      **Comment Status**    **A**

This standard is supposed to be written in English, or state machine notation, or, only when desperate, specified programming languages with references so that the reader can find what the syntax actually means (Pascal and Matlab have been used), and that code should if possible be executable by a machine. You can't just insert snippets of unattributed pseudo-code in I don't know what syntax.

**SuggestedRemedy**

If this pseudo-code fragment says anything that the preceding sentence doesn't, replace it with another sentence, in English. If it doesn't, delete it. Similarly in 76.2.3.1.3, 76.2.3.3.3

**Response**                      **Response Status**    **U**

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Insert at end of 76.1.6.1.4  
 "Code examples given in c76 adhere to the style of the "C" programming language."  
 Move 76.1.6.1.4 to new subclause 76.2.1.3

**Cl 76**      **SC 76.2.2.5.3**                      **P139**      **L5**                      # **2852**  
 Dawe, Piers                      Avago Technologies

**Comment Type**    **TR**                      **Comment Status**    **R**                      **C Code UnCngTxt-OOS**

Does this pseudo-C fragment say anything that the sentence above doesn't? It uses three sorts of brackets; what does this signify? The response to D2.1 comment 2712 didn't address these questions. Is '...' proper C syntax?

**SuggestedRemedy**

Delete this fragment or, if you must, make it part of an executable program in an informative annex. Similarly with the other fragments.

**Response**                      **Response Status**    **W**

REJECT.

The WG chair rules that this comment is out of scope not requiring recirculation.

Yes, the pseudo-code says more than the text description above. Specifically, it shows that FIFO\_DD is a zero-based array, with data shifting from higher index to lower index. This behaviour is assumed in the subsequent state machines (Figure 76-17, Figure 76-18).

Three sorts of brackets are part of standard C notation. Ellipses "..." indicate the omission of a repeating and predictable pattern - see e.g. Equation 76-1 and Subclause 3.2.8. Ellipses is not part of a standard C notation but it is appropriate in pseudo-C code used in our examples.

The Task Force believes that pseudo-code provides a more concise and unambiguous notation than could be achieved with textual description. No changes to the draft are needed.

The comment does not require recirculation for the following reasons:

- 1) It was submitted by a balloter who voted "Disapprove" on the previous ballot, thus the balloter's vote does not change.
- 2) The comment restates comments #2712, #2713 & #2714 from draft D2.1 ballot, which was submitted by the same balloter, and rejected. It can therefore be considered a "pile on" to the balloter's own comment.
- 3) The comment is made against text which did not change between D2.1 and D2.2 (i.e. did not change in the recirculated draft).

**Cl 76**    **SC 76.2.2.5.3**    **P181**    **L 5**    # 212713  
 Dawe, Piers    Avago Technologies

**Comment Type**    **TR**    **Comment Status**    **R**    **C Code**  
 "Does this pseudo-C fragment say anything that the sentence above doesn't? It uses three sorts of brackets; what does this signify?"

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Delete this fragment

**Response**    **Response Status**    **U**  
 REJECT.  
 See response to comment #2712

**Cl 76**    **SC 76.2.3**    **P121**    **L 16**    # 2815  
 Lin, Rujian    Shanghai Luster Terab

**Comment Type**    **E**    **Comment Status**    **R**    **UnCngTxt-OOS**  
 or to an XGMII

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 or to a XGMII

**Response**    **Response Status**    **C**  
 REJECT.  
 [comment is against the unchanged text and outside the scope of this ballot]

In this case the "an" is correct as "X", if written out begins with the letter "e".

**Cl 76**    **SC 76.2.3.1.3**    **P187**    **L 40**    # 212714  
 Dawe, Piers    Avago Technologies

**Comment Type**    **TR**    **Comment Status**    **R**    **C Code**  
 As far as I can see, all this pseudo-C fragment says that the sentence above doesn't, is that only the first 27 blocks are appended into the input buffer.

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Say that in words and delete this fragment. Similarly with the next three fragments.

**Response**    **Response Status**    **U**  
 REJECT.  
 See response to comment #2712

**Cl 76**    **SC 76.2.3.2**    **P121**    **L 41**    # 2802  
 Mandin, Jeff    PMC Sierra

**Comment Type**    **E**    **Comment Status**    **A**    **UnCngTxt-OOS**  
 Incorrect reference

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Change "72.2.2.1" to "77.2.2.1"

**Response**    **Response Status**    **C**  
 ACCEPT.

The TF and WG chairs rule that it is not a substantive change and the editor will use the editorial license to make this change.

[comment is against the unchanged text and outside the scope of this ballot]

Make active link to 77.2.2.1.

Cl 76 SC 76.3.2 P125 L 4648 # 2814  
Lin, Rujian Shanghai Luster Terab

Comment Type E Comment Status R UnCngTxt-OOS

In the OLT, the PCS operates at a 10 Gb/s rate in a continuous mode. In the ONU, the PCS may operate at a 10 Gb/s rate, as specified herein (10GBASE-PR), or at a 1 Gb/s rate, compliance with Cause 65 (10/1GBASE-PRX).

SuggestedRemedy

In the OLT, the PCS transmit function operates at 10 Gb/s rate in a continuous mode. In the ONU, the PCS transmit function may operate at 10 Gb/s rate, as specified herein (10GBASE-PR), or at 1 Gb/s rate, compliance with Cause 65 (10/1GBASE-PRX).

Response Response Status C

REJECT.  
Task Force agrees with this resolution.  
Passed by Voice without opposition  
In room: 16

Commenter agreed with this resolution.

- 1) It is noted that the Draft 2.2 document is technically correct and complete.
- 2) The above comment is made against unchanged text and therefore out of scope for this ballot.
- 3) The task force recognizes that the change suggested below would be an improvement and mandates the editor to resubmit this comment against draft D3.0. The editor shall provide the following proposed response:

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

As suggested but change "compliance with Cause 65" to "as specified in Clause 65"

Cl 76 SC 76.3.2.1 P126 L 40 # 2837  
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corporation

Comment Type E Comment Status R g 76-9/10 ref UnCngTxt-OOS

Text says "The Idle Detection function is implemented in the PCS as depicted in Figure 76-10 for ONUs and as depicted in Figure 76-9 for OLTs." while Figure 76-9 is first in the draft. Change as proposed below.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to read "The Idle Detection function is implemented in the PCS as depicted in Figure 76-9 for OLT and as depicted in Figure 76-10 for ONUs."

Response Response Status C

REJECT.  
Task Force agrees with this resolution.  
Passed by Voice without opposition  
In room: 16

Commenter agreed with this resolution.

- 1) It is noted that the Draft 2.2 document is technically correct and complete.
- 2) The above comment is made against unchanged text and therefore out of scope for this ballot.
- 3) The task force recognizes that the change suggested below would be an improvement and mandates the editor to resubmit this comment against draft D3.0. The editor shall provide the following proposed response:

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change to:  
"The Idle Deletion process is implemented in the PCS as depicted in Figure 76-9 for OLT and as depicted in Figure 76-10 for ONUs."

Cl 76 SC 76.3.2.1 P126 L 4041 # 2813  
Lin, Rujian Shanghai Luster Terab

Comment Type E Comment Status R g 76-9/10 ref UnCngTxt-OOS  
as depicted in Figure 76-10 for ONUs and as depicted in Figure 76-9 for OLTs.

SuggestedRemedy

as depicted in Figure 76-9 for OLTs and as depicted in Figure 76-10 for ONUs.

Response Response Status C

REJECT.  
[comment is against the unchanged text and outside the scope of this ballot]

This will be corrected as part of response to comment #2837

**Cl 76**    **SC 76.3.2.1.1**    **P127**    **L40**    # 2889  
 Kramer, Glen    Teknovus, Inc.

**Comment Type T**    **Comment Status R**

Constund IDLE\_COLUMN is not used anywhere in the draft.

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 delete definition for this constant

**Response**    **Response Status C**

REJECT.  
 The task force recognizes the validity of this comment and mandates the editor to resubmit this comment against draft D3.0. The editor shall provide the following proposed response:

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE  
 1) remove definition of IDLE\_COLUMN  
 2) modify definition of IDLE\_VECTOR in cl 76.3.3.7.2 by deleting the sentence starting with "It is formed ..."  
 3) move definition of IDLE\_VECTOR to cl 76.3.3.7.1 Constants.

**Cl 76**    **SC 76.3.2.1.5**    **P130**    **L1**    # 2885  
 Kramer, Glen    Teknovus, Inc.

**Comment Type T**    **Comment Status R**

In Figure 76-10, IdleCount counter can overflow during a long interburst gap.

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Add this line to RESET\_ALIGNMENT state:

"IdleCount = DelayBound"  
 (use proper assignment symbol)

**Response**    **Response Status C**

REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

**Cl 76**    **SC 76.3.2.4.1**    **P131**    **L22**    # 2803  
 Mandin, Jeff    PMC Sierra

**Comment Type T**    **Comment Status R**

Draft 2.2 removed the statement that the value of "alpha" for the GF used to define the RS(255, 223) code is represented bitwise as 0x02.

Some treatments/implementations of RS codes use reversed bit-ordering (cf. "Error Control Coding" by Lin and Costello pg. 564). Using the different representation of alpha will result in different Ax constants.

Hence the representation of alpha should be stated explicitly.

**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Change:

"alpha is a root of the binary primitive polynomial  $x^8+x^4+x^3+x^2+1$ "

to:

"alpha is a root of the binary primitive polynomial  $x^8+x^4+x^3+x^2+1$  and is represented as 0x02"

**Response**    **Response Status C**

REJECT.  
 Task Force agrees with this resolution.  
 Passed by Voice without opposition  
 In room: 16

Commenter agreed with this resolution.

1) It is noted that the Draft 2.2 document is technically correct and complete.  
 2) The task force recognizes that the change suggested below would be an improvement and mandates the editor to resubmit this comment against draft D3.0. The editor shall provide the following proposed response:

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Cl 76**    **SC 76.3.2.4.1**    **P131**    **L45**    # **2839**  
Hajduczenia, Marek    ZTE Corporation

**Comment Type E**    **Comment Status A**

Text says "A FEC parity vector is presented by" while it should say "A FEC parity vector is represented by"

**SuggestedRemedy**  
as per comment

**Response**    **Response Status C**  
ACCEPT.

The TF and WG chairs rule that it is not a substantive change and the editor will use the editorial license to make this change.

**Cl 76**    **SC 76.3.2.4.1**    **P131**    **L52**    # **2816**  
Lin, Rujian    Shanghai Luster Terab

**Comment Type E**    **Comment Status A**    *UnCngTxt-OOS*

D0 is the

**SuggestedRemedy**  
the subscript of D0 should not be in Italic form.

**Response**    **Response Status C**  
ACCEPT.

The TF and WG chairs rule that it is not a substantive change and the editor will use the editorial license to make this change.

[comment is against the unchanged text and outside the scope of this ballot]

**Cl 76**    **SC 76.3.2.4.1**    **P132**    **L18**    # **2817**  
Lin, Rujian    Shanghai Luster Terab

**Comment Type E**    **Comment Status A**    *UnCngTxt-OOS*

P31 is the first parity octet and P0 is the last. A data octet (P7, d6, ..., d1, d0) is identified with.....  
The d0 is identified as the LSB and d7 is identified as the MSB.....

**SuggestedRemedy**  
Unify the subscript not in Italic form.

**Response**    **Response Status C**  
ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The TF and WG chairs rule that it is not a substantive change and the editor will use the editorial license to make this change.

[comment is against the unchanged text and outside the scope of this ballot]

The problem is the symbols d0 and d7 in the refereced sentence are not included as frame "shrink wrapped" equations. The errant symbols will be fixed.

**Cl 76**    **SC 76.3.2.4.1**    **P132**    **L6**    # **2838**  
Hajduczenia, Marek    ZTE Corporation

**Comment Type E**    **Comment Status A**

Text "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 for all octets in accordance with the conventions of 3.1.1. Bit ordering shall be as illustrated in Figure 76û12." should have NOTE format and it does not

**SuggestedRemedy**  
Format accordingly.

**Response**    **Response Status C**  
ACCEPT.

The TF and WG chairs rule that it is not a substantive change and the editor will use the editorial license to make this change.

*Cl* 76    *SC* 76.3.2.5    *P*135    *L*13    # 2818  
 Lin, Rujian    Shanghai Luster Terab

*Comment Type*    **E**    *Comment Status*    **A**    *ONUs are be*  
 ONUs are be turned off between transmissions.

*SuggestedRemedy*  
 ONUs are turned off between transmissions.

*Response*    *Response Status*    **C**  
 ACCEPT.

The TF and WG chairs rule that it is not a substantive change and the editor will use the editorial license to make this change.

*Cl* 76    *SC* 76.3.2.5    *P*135    *L*13    # 2840  
 Hajduczenia, Marek    ZTE Corporation

*Comment Type*    **E**    *Comment Status*    **A**    *ONUs are be*  
 Text says "ONUs are be turned off between transmissions."

*SuggestedRemedy*  
 and should say "ONUs are turned off between transmissions."

*Response*    *Response Status*    **C**  
 ACCEPT.

The TF and WG chairs rule that it is not a substantive change and the editor will use the editorial license to make this change.

*Cl* 76    *SC* 76.3.2.5    *P*135    *L*3349    # 2823  
 Lin, Rujian    Shanghai Luster Terab

*Comment Type*    **T**    *Comment Status*    **R**    *UnCngTxt-OOS*  
 In Figure 76-14, there is no EOB after data and FEC.

*SuggestedRemedy*  
 According Figure 76-15, there should be a EOB after the last FEC codeword. So Figure 76-14 should be modified to show a EOB after the last FEC codeword.

*Response*    *Response Status*    **C**  
 REJECT.  
 Task Force agrees with this resolution.  
 Passed by Voice without opposition  
 In room: 15

Commenter agreed with this resolution.

1) It is noted that the Draft 2.2 document is technically correct and complete.  
 2) The above comment is made against unchanged text and therefore out of scope for this ballot.  
 3) The task force recognizes that the change suggested below would be an improvement and mandates the editor to resubmit this comment against draft D3.0. The editor shall provide the following proposed response:

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 76 SC 76.3.2.5 P137 L19 # 2886  
Kramer, Glen Teknovus, Inc.

Comment Type T Comment Status R

"Two consecutive XGMII transfers provide eight characters that are encoded into one 66-bit transmission block. The burst may occasionally be required to transmit an extra 4 bytes of data, causing the burst to extend into the next grant period."

The first sentence does not provide any new information. It describes 64B/66B encoding and thus is out of place in the Data Detector section. The second sentence is technically incorrect. EPON cannot work with a burst extending into another grant period.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the above paragraph.

Response Response Status C

REJECT.  
Task Force agrees with this resolution.  
Passed by Voice without opposition  
In room: 15

Commenter agreed with this resolution.

- 1) It is noted that the Draft 2.2 document is technically correct and complete.
- 2) The task force recognizes that the change suggested below would be an improvement and mandates the editor to resubmit this comment against draft D3.0. The editor shall provide the following proposed response:

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 76 SC 76.3.2.5 P137 L30 # 2875  
Frank, Chang Vitesse

Comment Type T Comment Status R UnCngTxt-OOS

I just realize the change of burst mode sync patterns which favor certain implementations. Taking into account of the 1G EPON practice, and 10GEPON on ac-coupling different from GPON, suggest to revisit 0x55 as preamble pattern (refer to 3av\_0805\_effenberg\_3)

SuggestedRemedy

Suggest to revisit 0x55 as preamble pattern (refer to 3av\_0805\_effenberg\_3)

Response Response Status C

REJECT.  
[comment is against the unchanged text and outside the scope of this ballot]

New sync pattern was thoroughly debated in the task force and accepted as described.  
[was Page 136 Line 950]

Cl 76 SC 76.3.2.5 P137 L3054 # 2877  
Frank, Chang Vitesse

Comment Type T Comment Status R UnCngTxt-OOS

I am pretty confused the conversion from hexadecimal to binary such as 0x55=1010 not 0101 if you check the following table.

Dec Hex Bin

0	0	0000
1	1	0001
2	2	0010
3	3	0011
4	4	0100
5	5	0101
6	6	0110
7	7	0111
8	8	1000
9	9	1001
10	A	1010
11	B	1011
12	C	1100
13	D	1101
14	E	1110
15	F	1111

SuggestedRemedy

Correct the inconsistency in the conversion from hexadecimal to binary, or did I miss anything?

Response Response Status C

REJECT.  
[comment is against the unchanged text and outside the scope of this ballot]

In Ethernet networks transmission is done LSB first. The text clearly states that the shown pattern represents a transmission sequence so that 0x55 is transmitted as 1 0 1 0.

Cl 76 SC 76.3.2.5.3 P139 L1 # 2851  
Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type TR Comment Status R C Code

The committee replied to D2.1 comment 2712 with some criticism of Pascal and a claim that C is a popular programming language but does not justify the use a programming language rather than English words (or state machine notation). It points to an example in 61A.3. That example is, I believe, a proper program that could run, which makes it unambiguous even if the reader is not fully expert in C, and it's informative, so one does not have to understand it to use the standard. In contrast, the fragments in this clause are incomplete and won't run (hence ambiguous), don't seem to serve any useful purpose, put an unnecessary burden on the standard's users, and raise ambiguity because they attempt to redefine material stated in English words. State diagrams with embedded bits of C is particularly horrible.

SuggestedRemedy

If you must decorate the draft with C, put the pieces together into one or a few executable programs in an informative appendix. Write the normative standard with the methods that the other 70+ clauses have found adequate; principally English words, failing that in state diagrams, Pascal or Matlab. Avoid short fragments. And, avoid pseudo-code.

Response Response Status W

REJECT.

The WG chair rules that this comment is out of scope not requiring recirculation.

The Task Force believes that pseudo-code provides a more concise and unambiguous notation than could be achieved with textual description. For example, see response to comment #2852. No changes to the draft are needed.

The comment does not require recirculation for the following reasons:

- 1) It was submitted by a balloter who voted "Disapprove" on the previous ballot, thus the balloter's vote does not change.
- 2) The comment restates comments #2712, #2713 & #2714 from draft D2.1 ballot, which was submitted by the same balloter, and rejected. It can therefore be considered a "pile on" to the balloter's own comment.
- 3) The comment is made against text which did not change between D2.1 and D2.2 (i.e. did not change in the recirculated draft).

Cl 76 SC 76.3.3.3 P151 L5 # 2798  
Mandin, Jeff PMC Sierra

Comment Type E Comment Status A UnCngTxt-OOS

Terminology

SuggestedRemedy

Change:

"The FEC decoder provides a user option to indicate an uncorrectable FEC block (due to an excess of symbols containing errors) to the PCS layer."

to:

The FEC decoder provides a user option to indicate an uncorrectable FEC block (due to an excess of symbols containing errors) to the higher layers.

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

The editor believes that, while this was submitted as an Editorial comment, it could be construed as a substantive change and is thus contrary to the motion, unanimously approved by the task force, to proceed to sponsor ballot. Therefore, using editorial license, this change will not be made at this time. The editor will resubmit this comment during sponsor ballot.

[comment is against the unchanged text and outside the scope of this ballot]



**Cl 76**      **SC 76.3.3.4.4**      **P154**      **L 28**      # **2887**  
 Kramer, Glen      Teknovus, Inc.

**Comment Type T**      **Comment Status R**

In Figure 76-23, timer should follow the notation defined in 64.1.5 or in 77.1.5

**SuggestedRemedy**

- 1) add expiration interval to the timer in state START\_TIMER
- 2) add brackets around timer in state START\_TIMER
- 3) add underscore between "interval\_timer" and "done" in 4 places

**Response**      **Response Status C**

REJECT.  
 Task Force agrees with this resolution.  
 Passed by Voice without opposition  
 In room: 15

Commenter agreed with this resolution.

- 1) It is noted that the Draft 2.2 document is technically correct and complete.
- 2) The task force recognizes that the change suggested below would be an improvement and mandates the editor to resubmit this comment against draft D3.0. The editor shall provide the following proposed response:

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 In START\_TIMER state change the last line to "[start interval\_timer, BER\_Monitor\_Interval]"  
 Use item 3 as is.

**Cl 76**      **SC 764.1.2**      **P158**      **L 20**      # **2890**  
 Kramer, Glen      Teknovus, Inc.

**Comment Type T**      **Comment Status R**

"the ONU TX clock tracks the ONU RX clock and in turn locks to OLT TX clock" is better written as

"the ONU TX clock tracks the ONU RX clock, which in turn locks to OLT TX clock"

**SuggestedRemedy**

Replace "and" with ", which"

**Response**      **Response Status C**

REJECT.  
 Task Force agrees with this resolution.  
 Passed by Voice without opposition  
 In room: 15

Commenter agreed with this resolution.

- 1) It is noted that the Draft 2.2 document is technically correct and complete.
- 2) The above comment is made against unchanged text and therefore out of scope for this ballot.
- 3) The task force recognizes that the change suggested below would be an improvement and mandates the editor to resubmit this comment against draft D3.0. The editor shall provide the following proposed response:

PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
 [changed from "E" to "T" because the change affects the technical meaning of the sentence]

**Cl 76A**      **SC 76A.1**      **P165**      **L56**      # **2853**  
 Dawe, Piers      Avago Technologies

**Comment Type E**      **Comment Status R**

Draft says 'http://www.ieee802.org/3/av/online\_resources/' This is not the usual place for such downloads.

**SuggestedRemedy**

Please review with 802.3 chair.

**Response**      **Response Status C**

REJECT.  
 Reviewed with WG Chair. No change is required at this time. However, in the future the chair may provide a URL for all task forces for this purpose.

Cl 76A SC 76A.2 P165 L42 # 2891  
Kramer, Glen Teknovus, Inc.

Comment Type E Comment Status A  
Continue sentence "Thus, the first ten bits transmitted are: 10 0100 0000 ." with the previous paragraph.

SuggestedRemedy

Response Response Status C  
ACCEPT.

The TF and WG chairs rule that it is not a substantive change and the editor will use the editorial license to make this change.

Cl 77 SC 77.2.2.3 P183 L36 # 2807  
Mandin, Jeff PMC Sierra

Comment Type T Comment Status R delayed  
The alignmentCorrect variable also checks for the data (rather than parity) transmission region.

This important function should be reflected in the name of the variable.za

SuggestedRemedy  
Change "alignmentCorrect" to either "alignmentAndTransmitRegionCorrect" or perhaps "DataTransmitOK"

Response Response Status C  
REJECT.  
Task Force agrees with this resolution.  
Passed by Voice without opposition  
In room: 15

Commenter agreed with this resolution.

- 1) It is noted that the Draft 2.2 document is technically correct and complete.
- 2) The task force recognizes that the change suggested below would be an improvement and mandates the editor to resubmit this comment against draft D3.0. The editor shall provide the following proposed response:

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
Delete definition of alignmentCorrect (no longer used in draft per comment #2804)

Cl 77 SC 77.2.2.3 P183 L40 # 2819  
Lin, Rujian Shanghai Luster Terab

Comment Type E Comment Status R delayed  
It is reset to false on the with the next increment of fecOffset.

SuggestedRemedy

It is reset to false with the next increment of fecOffset.

Response Response Status C  
REJECT.  
Comment issue will be fixed in later draft by resolution to comment #2807

Cl 77 SC 77.2.2.4 P186 L22 # 2892  
Eric, Lynskey Teknovus

Comment Type T Comment Status R delayed  
The constant COLUMN\_SIZE is not defined.

SuggestedRemedy

Define new constant in 77.2.2.1.

COLUMN\_SIZE  
TYPE: integer  
This constant represents the size of a column in octets.  
Value: 4

Response Response Status C  
REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

COLUMN\_SIZE no longer used in draft.  
See resolution to comment #2805.

*Cl 77*    *SC 77.2.2.4*    *P201*    *L 39*    # **2881**  
Kozaki, Seiji    Mitsubishi Electric

*Comment Type*    **T**    *Comment Status*    **R**

The equation of CheckGrantSize(length) is wrong.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Add "- fecOffset" at the end of the current one.  
Correct equation is as below. See also 3av\_0901\_kozaki\_1.pdf.  
 $FEC\_Overhead(length) = \text{ceiling}((fecOffset + length) / FEC\_PAYLOAD\_SIZE) * FEC\_CODEWORD\_SIZE - fecOffset$

*Response*    *Response Status*    **C**

REJECT.  
Task Force agrees with this resolution.  
Passed by Voice without opposition  
In room: 16

Commenter agreed with this resolution.

- 1) It is noted that the Draft 2.2 document is technically correct and complete.
- 2) The task force recognizes that the change suggested below would be an improvement and mandates the editor to resubmit this comment against draft D3.0. The editor shall provide the following proposed response:

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Add term "- fecOffset" to the end of definition of CheckGrantSize function.

*Cl 77*    *SC 77.2.2.7*    *P190*    *L 41*    # **2805**  
Mandin, Jeff    PMC Sierra

*Comment Type*    **T**    *Comment Status*    **R**    *delayed*

The FEC\_Overhead() function duplicates logic already present elsewhere in the control multiplexer - consequently unnecessary IDLEs are appended following end-of-frame.

This is one of three significant technical issues related to FEC handling in MPCP. The TF should evaluate these issues and resolve them in the current draft or the next one.

*SuggestedRemedy*

See 3av\_0109\_mandin\_2.pdf

*Response*    *Response Status*    **C**

REJECT.  
Task Force agrees with this resolution.  
Passed by Voice without opposition  
In room: 16

Commenter agreed with this resolution.

- 1) It is noted that the Draft 2.2 document is technically correct and complete.
- 2) The task force recognizes that the change suggested below would be an improvement and mandates the editor to resubmit this comment against draft D3.0. The editor shall provide the following proposed response:

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

- 1) Use FEC\_Overhead formula given in bullet 2, slide 4 of 3av\_0901\_kramer\_1.pdf
- 2) In Draft 2.2 page 186 delete the definition of "L" and accompanying text (lines 20-23).
- 3) delete note lines 26-27.

Cl 77 SC 77.2.2.7 P190 L9 # 2804  
Mandin, Jeff PMC Sierra

Comment Type T Comment Status R

The OLT control multiplexer erroneously performs the check for the PCS Parity region before it receives permission for transmission from Multipoint Transmission Control.

As a consequence there is no effective check for whether the PCS is transmitting parity - leading to transmit delay variation in excess of the maximum value of 1 TQ.

A similar problem is found in the ONU control multiplexer.

This is one of three serious issues related to FEC handling in MPCP. The TF should evaluate these issues and resolve them in the current draft or the next one.

SuggestedRemedy

See 3av\_0109\_mandin\_1.pdf

Response Response Status C

REJECT.  
Task Force agrees with this resolution.  
Passed by Voice without opposition  
In room: 16

Commenter agreed with this resolution.

- 1) It is noted that the Draft 2.2 document is technically correct and complete.
2) The task force recognizes that the change suggested below would be an improvement and mandates the editor to resubmit this comment against draft D3.0. The editor shall provide the following proposed response:

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

In state machine Figure 77-13, do the following changes:

- 1) remove term "alignmentCorrect\*" after state INIT on line 9.
2) use the following condition after state WAIT FOR TRANSMIT:
"transmitEnable = true \* (fecOffset < FEC\_PAYLOAD\_SIZE)"

In state machine Figure 77-14, do the following changes:

- 1) remove term "alignmentCorrect\*" after state INIT on line 9.
2) use the following condition into state PARSE OPCODE:
"Length/Type = MAC\_Control\_type \* (fecOffset < FEC\_PAYLOAD\_SIZE - 3)"
3) use the following condition from state TRANSMIT READY into state CHECK SIZE:
"Length/Type != MAC\_Control\_type \* (fecOffset < FEC\_PAYLOAD\_SIZE - 3)"
[use proper symbol for !=]

Cl 77 SC 77.2.2.7 P191 L29 # 2879  
Mandin, Jeff PMC Sierra

Comment Type T Comment Status R delayed\_until 15.01.2009

- 1. In the "Check Size" state of figure 77-14, when the result of the CheckGrantSize() function is divided by the tqSize, the quotient is rounded down rather than rounded up.
2. It will sometimes happen that the result of CheckGrantSize (in octet times) is larger than the number of TQ left in the grant, whereas the result of division by TqSize (ie. rounded down) is precisely equal to the number of TQ remaining in the grant.
3. In such a case, MPCP will allow the packet to be transmitted, but the data detector in the PCS will continue to transmit data past the end of the grant. This can then cause a collision with the transmission of a subsequent ONU and a missed burst.

This issue should be addressed by the TF and resolved in the current draft or the next one

SuggestedRemedy

- 1. On page 186 line 4 Change:

-----
"CheckGrantSize(length) = | (fecOffset + length) / FEC\_PAYLOAD\_SIZE| x
FEC\_CODEWORD\_SIZE"

to:

--- ---
"CheckGrantSize(length) = | T / tqSize |"

where:

-----
T = | (fecOffset + length) / FEC\_PAYLOAD\_SIZE| x FEC\_CODEWORD\_SIZE"

- 2. In the "Check Size" state of figure 77-14, modify the expression:

"nextTxTime <= CheckGrantSize(sizeof(data\_tx) + tailGuard)/tqSize"

to:

"nextTxTime <= CheckGrantSize(sizeof(data\_tx) + tailGuard)"

- 3.

Response Response Status C

REJECT.  
Task Force agrees with this resolution.  
Passed by Voice without opposition  
In room: 16

Commenter agreed with this resolution.

- 1) It is noted that the Draft 2.2 document is technically correct and complete.
- 2) The task force recognizes that the change suggested below would be an improvement and mandates the editor to resubmit this comment against draft D3.0. The editor shall provide the following proposed response:

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Accept Option #3 as shown on slides 7 & 8 from 3av\_0901\_mandin\_5.pdf

**Cl 77**      **SC 77.2.2.7**                      **P191**              **L 8**                      # **2806**  
 Mandin, Jeff                                      PMC Sierra

*Comment Type*    **T**                      *Comment Status*    **R**                                      *delayed*

The alignmentCorrect variable (used to check for PCS-layer parity transmission) delays frames so that they always start on column boundaries - and this prevents the application of the efficient Deficit Idle Count mechanism (clause 46).

This delay is unnecessary, because the operation of the DIC algorithm is transparent to the MPCP layer (as shown in the attached slides).

This is one of three significant technical issues related to FEC handling in MPCP. The TF should evaluate these issues and resolve them in the current draft or the next one.

*SuggestedRemedy*

See 3av\_0109\_mandin\_3.pdf

*Response*                                      *Response Status*    **C**

REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

See resolution to comment #2804

**Cl 77**      **SC 77.3.3.5**                      **P201**              **L 27**                      # **2888**  
 Kramer, Glen                                      Teknovus, Inc.

*Comment Type*    **T**                      *Comment Status*    **R**

Message parameters should not have default values. The parameters are always set explicitly in generating state diagrams.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Remove "This parameter has the default value of 0" from definitions for laserOnTime and laserOffTime

*Response*                                      *Response Status*    **C**

REJECT.  
 Task Force agrees with this resolution.  
 Passed by Voice without opposition  
 In room: 16

Commenter agreed with this resolution.

- 1) It is noted that the Draft 2.2 document is technically correct and complete.
- 2) The above comment is made against unchanged text and therefore out of scope for this ballot.
- 3) The task force recognizes that the change suggested below would be an improvement and mandates the editor to resubmit this comment against draft D3.0. The editor shall provide the following proposed response:

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 77 SC 77.3.3.6 P202 L31 # 2880  
Mandin, Jeff PMC Sierra

Comment Type T Comment Status R

In Draft 2.2, the 10GEPON Discovery State diagrams are instantiated on both the 10G and the 1G broadcast LLIDs.

This breaks the ability for a 10G OLT to support 1G ONUs in "dual-rate mode".

The cl77 state diagrams are supposed to be instantiated only on 7ffe and not 7fff.

This issue should be addressed by the TF and resolved in the current draft or the next one.

SuggestedRemedy

Change:

"Instantiation of state diagrams as described in Figure 77-19, Figure 77-20, and Figure 77-21 is performed only at the Multipoint MAC Control instances attached to the appropriate broadcast LLID(s) (0x7FFF and/or 0x7FFE for 1G-EPON and 10G-EPON, respectively)."

to:

"Instantiation of state diagrams as described in Figure 77-19, Figure 77-20, and Figure 77-21 is performed only at the Multipoint MAC Control instances attached to the broadcast LLID (0x7FFE).

Response Response Status C

REJECT.

Task Force agrees with this resolution.

Passed by Voice without opposition

In room: 16

Commenter agreed with this resolution.

- 1) It is noted that the Draft 2.2 document is technically correct and complete.
- 2) The task force recognizes that the change suggested below would be an improvement and mandates the editor to resubmit this comment against draft D3.0. The editor shall provide the following proposed response:

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 99 SC P11 L1 # 2883  
Kramer, Glen Teknovus, Inc.

Comment Type E Comment Status R

In table of contents, page numbers are not aligned properly for some clauses: 66, 66.5, 75, 75.10, 76, 76.5, 76.5.4, 77.5

SuggestedRemedy

Response Response Status C

REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

Cl 99 SC 99 P2 L11 # 2824  
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corporation

Comment Type E Comment Status A UnCngTxt-OOS

"single SM fiber" looks plain old wierd. There is a common abbreviation which can be used i.e. SMF

SuggestedRemedy

Change "single SM fiber" to "single SMF". The same also for line 12

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

The TF and WG chairs rule that it is not a substantive change and the editor will use the editorial license to make this change.

[comment is against the unchanged text and outside the scope of this ballot]

[Changed CommentType from "!" to "E"]

Cl 99 SC 99 P2 L12 # 2865  
Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type TR Comment Status R

This abstract avoids telling the reader that there is a draft new transmission scheme in Annex 31C, unrelated to anything described here.

SuggestedRemedy

Add a sentence: 'A MAC Control organization specific extension enables Physical Layer Operations, Administration, and Management (PLOAM) messages.'

Response Response Status W

REJECT.

The WG chair rules that this comment is a restatement of a previous comment not requiring recirculation.

The EXTENSION MAC Control message was added by directive of the 802.3 WG at the July 2008 plenary meeting - please see motion number #3 in minutes\_0708.pdf.

Please note that EXTENSION MAC Control message does not define any new transmission schemes as implied in the comment. It only defines a format and processing of an EXTENSION MAC Control frame.

EXTENSION mechanism is a very small part of the overall draft and does not need to be mentioned in the abstract any more than for example 10Gb/s FEC or dual-rate operation mode. The abstract should describe the overall goal of the standard and not specific details. Moreover, abstract and frontmatter is not part of the standard and will be removed by Staff Editors prior to publication of 802.3 standard. No changes to the draft are needed.

The comment does not require recirculation for the following reasons:

- 1) It was submitted by a balloter who voted "Disapprove" on the previous ballot, thus the balloter's vote does not change.
- 2) The comment restates comments #2707 from draft D2.1 ballot, which was submitted by the same balloter, and rejected. It can therefore be considered a "pile on" to the balloter's own comment.

Cl 99 SC 99 P2 L12 # 212707  
Dawe, Piers Avago Technologies

Comment Type TR Comment Status R

This abstract avoids telling the reader that there is a draft new transmission scheme in Annex 31C, unrelated to anything described here.

SuggestedRemedy

Either remove the draft new transmission scheme in Annex 31C or add text here to mention it. This could be done by an additional objective.

Response Response Status U

REJECT.

Front matter is not part of the published standard. Independently of that, the abstract does not need to list every minor mechanism added to the draft. The EXTENSION MAC Control message was added at the directive of 802.3 Working Group at the July 2008 plenary meeting. Please review meeting minutes.

Response accepted by voice vote without opposition.

Cl 99 SC 99 P2 L18 # 2826  
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corporation

Comment Type E Comment Status A

Inconsistent capitalization for "forward error correction (FEC)"

SuggestedRemedy

Change to "Forward Error Correction (FEC)"

Response Response Status C

ACCEPT.

The TF and WG chairs rule that it is not a substantive change and the editor will use the editorial license to make this change.

Change all (1) instances (c56, pg 56 line 14) of "Forward Error Correction" to "forward error correction"

Cl 99 SC 99 P2 L5 # 2825

Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corporation

Comment Type E Comment Status R

is "already deployed equipment.". Can be further specified

SuggestedRemedy

Change "already deployed equipment." to "already deployed 1G-EPON equipment."

Response Response Status C

REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.