

CI 75 SC 75.4.1 P 78 L 1 # 1  
 Hamano, Hiroshi Fujitsu Labs.

Comment Type T Comment Status X

As pointed out in 3av\_0811\_hamano\_2.pdf, lower transmitter ER causes excess sensitivity degradation at an APD receiver, even for the downstream. But Figure 75-4 does not illustrate this precisely.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Add a note below Figure 75-4:  
 'Some receiver may suffer excess sensitivity degradation due to ER decrease, and the transmitter power increase for ER compensation, illustrated in Figure 75-4, may be insufficient. In that case, an additional sensitivity margin should also be allocated at the receiver.'

Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 75 SC 75.7.12 P 89 L 41 # 2  
 Frank , Chang Vitesse

Comment Type T Comment Status X

Similar argument to test RX SRS at 1E-3 for upsteam against the specs defined in Table 75-6 (while less issue for downstream in continuous mode).

*SuggestedRemedy*

Same as prior comment #30.

Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 76 SC 76.4.2.1 P 152 L 2936 # 3  
 Frank , Chang Vitesse

Comment Type T Comment Status X

I recently spend significant time to check the CDR locking times using the existing commercial test gears available in the market. Taking into account CDR locking time are tested against BER of 1E-3, I feel impractical for test gears to sync up at such low BER. For gated BER test, my observation is the lowest sync up BER is in the range of 1E-5 and 1E-6.

This issue applies also to RX SRS test for upsteam, while less issue for downstream.

*SuggestedRemedy*

One option could be to include FEC while measuring CDR lock time, but this could be difficult for vendors who donot have BM FEC available.

Another option is to apply BER at 1E-6 (with margin) or pre-scale to the power for 1E-3. I encourage TF to look into this practical issue, and call on other vendors' inputs, so make the draft practical enough for implementation.

Proposed Response Response Status O

CI 99 SC P L # 5  
 Frank , Chang Vitesse

Comment Type T Comment Status X

Previous comment #2869, #2870 etc to suggest numbers are rounded to nearest 0.1. The specs based on calculations with two decimal digit precision does facilitate the practical implementation of 10G EPON stds.

Keep in mind -0.22dBm in Table 60-3 is one exceptional case, which is undertsandable from common sense.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Pls re-visit 3av\_0901\_chang\_1.pdf

Proposed Response Response Status O

---

CI 99 SC Contents P 11-16 L # 4  
Frank , Chang Vitesse

Comment Type E Comment Status X

Even when the draft reach the stage of D3.0, I am still pretty frustrated to align the clause with its assigned page numbers of the Contents.

*SuggestedRemedy*

The assigned page #s for many cluases just name a few like Clause 67, 75, 77 are misplaced, suggest to fix them up.

For example: Clause 75.1 start from pg. 67, not 61, etc

Also alot of typos such as:

pg.11, line 19: "eration31";  
pg.11, line 53: "transport55";  
pg.12, line 19: "PRX61";  
pg.13, line 38: "PRX90";  
pg.14, line 8: "EPON109";  
and many more.

Proposed Response Response Status O