

Cl 00 SC 0 P L # 127
Mandin, Jeff

Comment Type T Comment Status D

There are several important comments against draft 2.2 which were deferred for resubmission against 3.0.
[This comment is contained in the file attached to comment #68 and has been added to the database as a separate comment to make processing simpler]

SuggestedRemedy

Resolve the following comments in
http://www.ieee802.org/3/av/public/2009_01/3av_0901_comments_d2_2_accepted.pdf
according to the resolutions indicated in that file:
2803
2804
2805
2807
2879
2880

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
See ref. comment in d3p0 database.
2803 - 11
2804 - 12
2805 - 13
2807 - 14
2879 - 34
2880 - 35

Cl 00 SC 0 P L # 31
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type E Comment Status D

[Resubmitted from January 2009 meeting (see D2.2 comment #2868)]
Confusing for abbreviation: RS=Reconciliation Sublayer vs. RS=Reed-Solomon

SuggestedRemedy

??

Proposed Response Response Status W

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 0 L 0 # 43
Turner, Michelle

Comment Type ER Comment Status D

This document has met all editorial requirements.

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.
The Editors appreciate the input. No changes required to the draft.

Cl 00 SC 0 P1 L1 # 68
Mandin, Jeffrey PMC-Sierra

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

*** Comment submitted with the file 31599900024-ballot_comments.csv attached ***

CSV file with multiple comments is attached.
The "multiple comment" upload facility would not accept the csv file produced by the 802.3 commentary tool.

SuggestedRemedy

See CSV file for approximately 40 comments.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
See individual comments tagged with the string "[This comment is contained in the file attached to comment #68 and has been added to the database as a separate comment to make processing simpler]" in the Comment field.

Cl 00 SC 0 P2 L1 # 73
Law, David 3Com

Comment Type E Comment Status D

The abstract is not of the usual format, the Task Force Chair to work with the Working Group Chair to develop the abstract - a start is provided in the suggested remedy.

SuggestedRemedy

This amendment to IEEE Std 802.3-2008 extends Ethernet Passive Optical Networks (EPONs) operation to 10Gb/s providing both symmetric, 10Gb/s downstream and upstream, and asymmetric, 10Gb/s downstream and 1Gb/s upstream, data rates. It specifies extensions to the 10Gb/s Reconciliation Sublayer, 10GBASE-PR symmetric and 10/1GBASE-PRX Physical Coding Sublayers (PCSs) and Physical Media Attachments (PMAs), and Physical Medium Dependent sublayers (PMDs) that support passive optical splitters ratios of 1:16 and 1:32, and distances of at least 10 km and at least 20 km. An additional MAC Control opcode is also defined to provided organization specific extension operation.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
After the Chairs sit together the resultant text will be incorporated into the draft.

Cl 00 SC 0 P33 L7 # 75
Kramer, Glen Teknovus, Inc.

Comment Type E Comment Status D

[Submitted on behalf of Eric Lynskey]
Editor's notes at beginning of each clause should be updated to reference IEEE 802.3-2008 instead of P802.3ay(D2.2).

SuggestedRemedy

See comment.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Maybe it's time to remove these notes?

Cl 00 SC 76.3.2.5.3 P132 L50 # 72
Law, David 3Com

Comment Type T Comment Status D

State diagram function do not include a () at the end of the function name.

SuggestedRemedy

Removed the '()' from the end of the function names and the actions in the states.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
[moved from cl 76 to cl 00]
Remove 33 instances of "()" in cl 76 and 77 in text and figures.

Cl 01 SC 1.1 P19 L54 # 30
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type T Comment Status D
[Resubmitted from January 2009 meeting (see D2.2 comment #2863)]
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.

Proposed Response Response Status W
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 L3 # 26
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type E Comment Status D
[Resubmitted from January 2009 meeting (see D2.2 comment #2854)]
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'.

Proposed Response Response Status W
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 01 SC 1.4 P20 L21 # 23
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type E Comment Status D
[Resubmitted from January 2009 meeting (see D2.2 comment #2841)]
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."

Proposed Response Response Status W
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 01 SC 1.4 P20 L28 # 20
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type E Comment Status D
[Resubmitted from January 2009 meeting (see D2.2 comment #2829)]
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

Proposed Response Response Status W
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 01 SC 1.4.254 P14 L41 # 44
Obara, Satoshi Fujitsu Component LT

Comment Type E Comment Status D
The OUI is defined by IEEE stds 802 overview and architecture.

SuggestedRemedy
Change "see <http://standards.ieee.org/regauth/index.html>" into "IEEE std 802-2001".

Proposed Response Response Status W
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 01 **SC 1.5** **P20** **L 54** # **27**
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

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

[Resubmitted from January 2009 meeting (see D2.2 comment #2856)]
Distributed Feedback Laser (abbreviation is used in 67A.3 and 75.5.1)

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

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

Cl 30 **SC 30.2.2.1** **P17** **L 35** # **116**
Barrass, Hugh Cisco Systems, Inc.

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

Even if we do decide to add an opcode for unspecified communications, it does not justify a whole new entity for one opcode.
EXTENSION can sit within oMACControlFunctionEntity

SuggestedRemedy
Don't make a new entity, place aEXTENSIONMACCtrlFramesTransmitted and aEXTENSIONMACCtrlFramesReceived into oMACControlFunctionEntity

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**
PROPOSED REJECT.
The proposed entity was approved by both the Working Group and the Task Force.
Furthermore, oMACControlFunctionEntity definition (below) clearly indicates this if to be used for PAUSE.
"If implemented, oMACControlFunctionEntity is contained within oMACControlEntity. The oMACControlFunctionEntity managed object class provides the management controls necessary to allow an instance of the MAC Control PAUSE function to be managed."

Cl 30 **SC 30.3.1.1.2a** **P20** **L 3** # **115**
Barrass, Hugh Cisco Systems, Inc.

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

2 points:
1. This is one of more than 100 instances of ""resetable"" - if you want to correct it, you should at least put a note in to direct the editor to fix all instances in the next revision.
2. When highlighting a spelling error, you should at least check your own spelling - change ""sentance"" to ""sentence.""

SuggestedRemedy
change ""sentance"" to ""sentence.""
Change parenthetic note to read ""(note second "t" in "nonresettable" is missing in this and other instances)""

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

Cl 30 **SC 30.3.2.1.2** **P26** **L 12** # **24**
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

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

[Resubmitted from January 2009 meeting (see D2.2 comment #2843)]
"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

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

Cl 30 SC 30.3.7.1.5 P27 L19 # 63
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

Definition of aGoodLLID says "A count of frames received that contain a valid SLD field, as defined in 65.1.3.3.1 or 76.2.6.1.3.1, as appropriate, but do not pass the CRC--8 check as defined in 65.1.3.3.3 or 76.2.6.1.3.3, as appropriate.;" which is incorrect. a GoodLLID should be incremented when a frame has a valid SLD and passes CRC-8 check (hence has good LLID as the name suggest). Compare also definition with aBadLLID in 30.3.7.1.8, where it says "and pass the CRC-8 check".

SuggestedRemedy

in definition of aGoodLLID change "as appropriate, but do not pass the CRC--8 check as defined in 65.1.3.3.3 or 76.2.6.1.3.3, " to read "as appropriate, and passes the CRC--8 check as defined in 65.1.3.3.3 or 76.2.6.1.3.3, "

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 30 SC 30.5.1.1.15 P29 L4 # 64
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

30.5.1.1.15 aFECCorrectedBlocks and 30.5.1.1.16 aFECUncorrectableBlocks were updated in 10G-EPON. Why 30.5.1.1.13 aFECAbility and 30.5.1.1.14 aFECmode are not updated ? They can still be read and have some undefined value for 10G-EPON.

SuggestedRemedy

Insert the following text before 30.5.1.1.15 aFECCorrectedBlocks
BLOCK 1:

"30.5.1.1.13 aFECAbility

Change the behaviour definition to read as follows:

A read-only value that indicates if the PHY supports a FEC sublayer for forward error correction (optional for 65.2 and Clause 74, mandatory for Clause 76).

If a Clause 45 MDIO Interface to the PCS is present, then this attribute will map to FEC capable bit in FEC capability register (see 45.2.8.2) for 1000BASE-PX or 10GBASE-R FEC ability bit in 10GBASE-R FEC ability register (see 45.2.1.84) or 10 Gb/s FEC ability bit in 10GBASE-PR and 10/1GBASE-PRX FEC ability register (see 45.2.3.29).

"

"or 10GBASE-R FEC ability bit in 10GBASE-R FEC ability register (see 45.2.1.84)" was added, since 10GBASE-R has such a bit in register and it was not mentioned in there.

BLOCK 2:

"30.5.1.1.14 aFECmode

Change the behaviour definition to read as follows:

A read-write value that indicates the mode of operation of the FEC sublayer for forward error correction (optional for 65.2 and Clause 74, mandatory for Clause 76).

A GET operation returns the current mode of operation of the PHY. A SET operation changes the mode of operation of the PHY to the indicated value. When Clause 73 Auto-Negotiation is enabled a SET operation is not allowed and a GET operation maps to the variable FEC enabled in Clause 74. A SET operation is not allowed and a GET operation maps to "enabled" for Clause 76.

If a Clause 45 MDIO Interface to the PCS is present, then this attribute will map to FEC enable bit in FEC control register (see 45.2.8.3) for 1000BASE-PX or FEC enable bit in 10GBASE-R FEC control register (see 45.2.1.85) or 10 Gb/s FEC enable bit in 10GBASE-PR and 10/1GBASE-PRX FEC control register (see 45.2.3.30).;

"

Original reference "45.2.7.3" for 1000BASE-PX was incorrect - 45.2.8.3 is probably correct.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 31A **SC 31A** **P32** **L 10** # **46**
Barrass, Hugh Cisco Systems, Inc.

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

There are a myriad of protocols that allow transmission of vendor specific information, there is no need to add MAC control frames to that number.
There is no objective for this addition, neither is there any mention in the PAR or 5 criteria of expanding the definition of MAC control frames to include general purpose, vendor specific communication.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete the changes to the Reserved row of Table 31A-1; Delete Table 31A-8; Delete Annex 31C.

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

PROPOSED 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 31C **SC 31C.3.1** **P36** **L 28** # **74**
Kramer, Glen Teknovus, Inc.

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

[Submitted on behalf of Eric Lynskey]
The ITU OUI should be explicitly shown in Figure 31C-1, just as the Opcode and Length/Type values are shown.

SuggestedRemedy

Add the opcode 00-19-A7 to the figure.

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

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 45 **SC 45.2.1** **P39** **L 43** # **28**
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

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

[Resubmitted from January 2009 meeting (see D2.2 comment #2858)]
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'.

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

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 45 **SC 45.2.1.10** **P34** **L 34** # **77**
Kramer, Glen Teknovus, Inc.

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

[Submitted on behalf of Eric Lynskey]
Table 45-11 is being changed. In the base document, this table is in subclause 45.2.1.10. Here, it is shown as part of 45.2.1.10.1.

SuggestedRemedy

Move table back into 45.2.1.10.

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

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 45 **SC 45.2.1.10.1** **P34** **L 37** # **117**
Barrass, Hugh Cisco Systems, Inc.

Comment Type **E** **Comment Status** **D** *inserted Style*

The preferred approach to inserted subclauses is to use letters to differentiate the inserted subclause from the existing ones in the base document.
Look at other projects such as 802.3at, 802.3az and 802.3ba for examples.

SuggestedRemedy

Change 45.2.1.10.1 to 45.2.1.10.1a, delete ""renumber remaining subclauses in 45.2.1.10 as appropriate"" in the note.

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

PROPOSED REJECT.
Per IEEE Staff Editors the draft is acceptable (see comment # 43). Making this change would only result in style churn in the draft and increase the chance of introducing errors into the draft.

Cl 45 **SC 45.2.1.10.1** **P35** **L 34** # **78**
Kramer, Glen Teknovus, Inc.

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

[Submitted on behalf of Eric Lynskey]
Editing instructions are confusing. One row is being changed and one row is being added.

SuggestedRemedy

Change instructions to "Change Table 45-11 as follows."

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

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
This change would necessitate duplication of the rest of table 45-11. Change instruction to: "Change Table 45-11 as follows, insert new row 2 (excluding header row) and modify row 1. Existing rows 2-10 are shifted down one row but remain essentially the same."

Cl 45 **SC 45.2.1.11** **P36** **L1** # 120
 Barrass, Hugh Cisco Systems, Inc.

Comment Type **E** **Comment Status** **D** *inserted Style*

The preferred approach to inserted subclauses is to use letters to differentiate the inserted subclause from the existing ones in the base document. Look at other projects such as 802.3at, 802.3az and 802.3ba for examples.

SuggestedRemedy

Change 45.2.1.11 to 45.2.1.11a, delete ""renumber succeeding paragraphs and tables"" in the note. Change the table designation to 45-12a

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

PROPOSED REJECT.
 See comment # 117

Cl 45 **SC 45.2.1.11** **P36** **L1** # 128
 Mandin, Jeff

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

The "P2MP PMA/PMD Abilities Register" has nothing to do with P2MP eg. it has nothing to do w/ 1G-EPON.
 [This comment is contained in the file attached to comment #68 and has been added to the database as a separate comment to make processing simpler]

SuggestedRemedy

Globally change name of "P2MP PMA/PMD Abilities Register" to "10G-EPON PMA/PMD Abilities Register".

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

PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 Replace 5 instances of "P2MP PMA/PMD ability register" with "10G-EPON PMA/PMD Abilities Register" on pgs 42/43.

Cl 45 **SC 45.2.1.4.1** **P34** **L29** # 76
 Kramer, Glen Teknovus, Inc.

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

[Submitted on behalf of Eric Lynskey]
 Editing instructions should be kept as close to the changes as possible. In this instance, the table to be changed is on the next page, even though the subclause heading is on this page. It needs to be very clear that the table on the next page is actually part of 45.2.1.6 and not part of 45.2.1.10.1.

SuggestedRemedy

Move text beginning with 45.2.1.10 after Table 45-7.

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

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 45 **SC 45.2.1.6** **P35** **L8** # 118
 Barrass, Hugh Cisco Systems, Inc.

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

A number of codepoints are undefined - e.g. 11011, 11100 etc.

SuggestedRemedy

Add 2 lines:
 11011 reserved
 111xx reserved

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

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Add as follows:
 111xx reserved (value always 0, writes ignored)
 11011 reserved (value always 0, writes ignored)

Cl 45 **SC 45.2.1.6.1** **P44** **L46** # 29
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

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

[Resubmitted from January 2009 meeting (see D2.2 comment #2862)]
 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.

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

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 45 SC 45.2.3 P39 L7 # 121
Barrass, Hugh Cisco Systems, Inc.

Comment Type T Comment Status D 45.2.3

Is there anything about these FEC control and status registers that suggests that they will NEVER be usable by any other PHY type at any time in the future? If not, the PHY type should not be captured in the register names.

Suggested Remedy

Change register names (and related subclauses) to remove the PHY names: e.g. FEC ability register, FEC control register

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Impacts: most all of 45.2.3. In this section strike:

"10GBASE-PR and 10/1GBASE-PRX", "10/1GBASE-PRX and 10GBASE-PR"

"10GBASE-PR" and

"10/1GBASE-PRX"

See 3av_0903_remain_1.pdf for details of change.

Cl 45 SC 45.2.3.29 P39 L44 # 119
Barrass, Hugh Cisco Systems, Inc.

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

If the FEC does not indicate errors to higher layers by invalidating the contents of the FEC block when uncorrectable errors are detected then the probability of false packet acceptance increases dramatically. Because an uncorrectable FEC block contains multiple errors, the CRC check will lose its property that it will always detect single and multiple bit errors. Therefore, the probability of false packet acceptance changes.

Instead of $P(\text{false packet}) \approx P(\text{single error} - 10^{-12})^4 \cdot 2^{-32}$

It becomes $P(\text{false packet}) = P(\text{uncorrectable FEC}) \cdot 2^{-32}$

Unless it has been proved that this latter equation still results in a Mean Time to False Packet Acceptance greater than 10^{10} years then this function is unacceptable

Suggested Remedy

Delete 3.74.1 & 3.75.1

Change the PHY clauses to make it clear that error indication is mandatory.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The task force discussed this issue and has agreed that the ability to pass uncorrectable FEC blocks is desirable as multiple frames can be contained in a single FEC block.

Marking the entire FEC block as errored can cause error amplification resulting in a failure to meet packet loss ratios. However, the concern expressed is also valid.

The paragraph in cl 76.3.3.3 starting at pg 145 line 5 will be modified as follows:

"The FEC decoder shall indicate an uncorrectable FEC block (due to an excess of symbols containing errors) to the PCS layer. The FEC decoder checks for the value of decode_success. If the variable decode_success is set to FALSE, then each sync header of the received payload blocks in the FEC codeword is set to a value of binary 00. However, the data blocks are nevertheless passed to the descrambler to maintain descrambling synchronization."

The FEC decoder may provide a user option to pass an uncorrectable FEC block to the PCS layer unchanged. If this option is set to FALSE, the sync headers and data blocks are passed to the descrambler unchanged."

Under the definition of mark_uncorrectable (pg 145 ln 21) add the following:

"Default: TRUE"

IN PICS change FE3 (pg 156 ln 40) from "O" to "M"

(see 3av_0903_remain_5.pdf)

Cl 45 SC 45.2.3.29 P39 L48 # 122
Barrass, Hugh Cisco Systems, Inc.

Comment Type T Comment Status D 45.2.3

There is no need to specify the PHY types in the description for the control bit. Also in 45.2.3.29.2 description states that this bit is only used for 10GBASE-PR or 10/1GBASE-PRX and is mandatory for both these PHY types - which seems to indicate that the bit is redundant.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the description in Table 45-108 for 10Gb/s FEC ability to read: This bit indicates that the PCS supports FEC for 10Gb/s PHYs or for the 10GB/s direction of dual speed PHYs.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
See 3av_0903_remain_1.pdf for details of change.

Cl 45 SC 45.2.3.29 P45 L47 # 5
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type E Comment Status D 45.2.3

[Resubmitted from January 2009 meeting (see D2.2 comment #2796)]
wordsmithing/consistency

SuggestedRemedy

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

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.
See 3av_0903_remain_1.pdf for details of change.

Cl 45 SC 45.2.3.29 P45 L48 # 6
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type E Comment Status D 45.2.3

[Resubmitted from January 2009 meeting (see D2.2 comment #2797)]
wordsmithing

SuggestedRemedy

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

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.
Note parentheses are removed for editorial reasons.
See 3av_0903_remain_1.pdf for details of change.

Cl 45 SC 45.2.3.29.2 P40 L10 # 79
Kramer, Glen Teknovus, Inc.

Comment Type E Comment Status D 45.2.3

[Submitted on behalf of Eric Lynskey]
Typo.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace or with of.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
See 3av_0903_remain_1.pdf for details of change.

Cl 45 SC 45.2.3.29.2 P40 L13 # 123
Barrass, Hugh Cisco Systems, Inc.

Comment Type E Comment Status D 45.2.3

Reference to 45.2.7.2 is incorrect.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to 45.2.8.2

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.
See 3av_0903_remain_1.pdf for details of change.

Cl 45 SC 45.2.3.30.1 P40 L35 # 80
Kramer, Glen Teknovus, Inc.

Comment Type T Comment Status D 45.2.3

[Submitted on behalf of Eric Lynskey]

The FEC enable error indication control bit is only valid if the FEC error indication ability is set. The description should indicate that if FEC error indication ability is not available then writing to this bit has no effect. If FEC error indication ability is not available, then perhaps this bit should return a value of 0 when read and ignore writes.

SuggestedRemedy

Add a sentence, "If FEC error indication ability in 3.47.1 reads 0, then a read of this bit will return 0 and writes are ignored."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
See 3av_0903_remain_1.pdf for details of change.

Cl 45 SC 45.2.3.30.2 P41 L2 # 124
Barrass, Hugh Cisco Systems, Inc.

Comment Type E Comment Status D 45.2.3

Reference to 45.2.7.3 is incorrect.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to 45.2.8.3

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.
See 3av_0903_remain_1.pdf for details of change.

Cl 45 SC 45.2.3.30.2 P47 L1 # 8
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type E Comment Status D 45.2.3

[Resubmitted from January 2009 meeting (see D2.2 comment #2799)]
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"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.
See 3av_0903_remain_1.pdf for details of change.

Cl 45 SC 45.2.3.31 P41 L8 # 81
Kramer, Glen Teknovus, Inc.

Comment Type T Comment Status D

[Submitted on behalf of Eric Lynskey]

Subclause 76.3.3.1.2 does not contain a definition of this counter.

SuggestedRemedy

Add definition.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Change reference in 45.2.3.31 to 76.3.3.3.2
See 3av_0903_remain_1.pdf for details of change (update link).
Add to Clause 76.3.3.3.2:

FEC_corrected_blocks_counter

A corrected block is an FEC block that has invalid parity, and has been corrected by the FEC decoder.

FEC_corrected_blocks_counter counts once for each corrected FEC block processed. This is a 32-bit counter. This variable is provided by a management interface that may be mapped to the 45.2.3.31 register (3.76, 3.77).

Cl 45 SC 45.2.3.31 P47 L8 # 61
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

Probably incorrect reference. Text says "See 76.3.3.1.2 for a definition of this counter" but 76.3.3.1.2 contains definition of only "decode_failures" which is "Counter that holds the number of consecutive decoding failures" and "sh_wndw_cnt" which is "Count of the number of sync headers checked within the current 62-block window", both of which are irrelevant at this point.

SuggestedRemedy

Either remove this reference or fix it.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
See comment #81

Cl 45 **SC 45.2.3.32** **P41** **L 28** # **82**
 Kramer, Glen Teknovus, Inc.

Comment Type T **Comment Status D** **45.2.3**
 [Submitted on behalf of Eric Lynskey]
 Subclause 76.3.3.1.2 does not contain a definition of this counter.

SuggestedRemedy
 Add definition.

Proposed Response **Response Status W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Change reference in 45.2.3.31 to 76.3.3.3.2
 See 3av_0903_remain_1.pdf for details of change (update link).
 Add to Clause 76.3.3.3.2:
 FEC_uncorrected_blocks_counter
 An uncorrected block is an FEC block that has invalid parity, and has not been corrected by the FEC decoder.
 FEC_uncorrected_blocks_counter counts once for each uncorrected FEC block processed.
 This is a 32-bit counter. This variable is provided by a management interface that may be mapped to the 45.2.3.32 register (3.78, 3.79).

Cl 45 **SC 45.2.3.33** **P41** **L 1** # **125**
 Barrass, Hugh Cisco Systems, Inc.

Comment Type T **Comment Status D** **45.2.3**
 Is it necessary to define another BER monitor, separate to 3.33.13:8

SuggestedRemedy
 Delete the new register and edit the extra requirements for 10G EPON into the definition for 3.33.13:8 & related register. Make appropriate changes in PHY clauses.

Proposed Response **Response Status W**
 PROPOSED REJECT.
 Register 3.80 provides for a variable threshold whereas register 3.33 and related control bits do not provide this functionality.

Cl 45 **SC 45.2.3.33** **P42** **L 11** # **129**
 Mandin, Jeff

Comment Type T **Comment Status D** **45.2.3**
 Default value for high BER in BER monitor correspond to 10⁻⁴. They should correspond to eg. 10⁻²
 [This comment is contained in the file attached to comment #68 and has been added to the database as a separate comment to make processing simpler]

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response **Response Status W**
 PROPOSED REJECT.
 It is not obvious why 10⁻² is to be preferred over 10⁻⁴.

Cl 45 **SC 45.2.3.33** **P48** **L 8** # **62**
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type ER **Comment Status D** **45.2.3**
 Table 45-111 has incorrect bit order. 3.80.0:7 should be in row 3, while 3.80.8:15 in row 2. Compare e.g. Table 45-112 or 45-108.

SuggestedRemedy
 Fix it: 3.80.0:7 should be in row 3, while 3.80.8:15 in row 2.

Proposed Response **Response Status W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 See 3av_0903_remain_1.pdf for details of change

Cl 45 **SC 45.2.3.34.2** **P43** **L 7** # **83**
 Kramer, Glen Teknovus, Inc.

Comment Type T **Comment Status D**
 [Submitted on behalf of Eric Lynskey]
 No PICS statement for this shall.

SuggestedRemedy
 Add PICS or remove shall.

Proposed Response **Response Status W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 Change shall to should
 (See 3av_0903_remain_1.pdf for details of change)

Cl 56 SC 56.1.2 P50 L19 # 47
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D
 [Submitted on behalf of Runjian Lin]
 upstream direction (10/1G-EPON)
 SuggestedRemedy
 in the upstream direction (10/1G-EPON)
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 56 SC 56.1.2 P56 L20 # 3
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.
 Comment Type E Comment Status D
 [Resubmitted from January 2009 meeting (see D2.2 comment #2792)]
 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)"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 56 SC 56.1.2.1 P50 L34 # 48
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D
 [Submitted on behalf of Runjian Lin]
 and 10/1G-EPON, respectively..
 SuggestedRemedy
 and 10/1G-EPON, respectively.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED REJECT.
 The typo is not found in the draft.

Cl 56 SC 56.1.2.1 P50 L34 # 65
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.
 Comment Type E Comment Status D
 Typo "and 10/1G-EPON, respectively"
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change to "and 10/1G-EPON, respectively."
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED REJECT.
 The typo is not found in the draft.

Cl 56 SC 56.1.3 P51 L29 # 49
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D
 [Submitted on behalf of Runjian Lin]
 of at least 1:32;
 SuggestedRemedy
 of at least 1:32.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 56 SC 56.1.3 P54 L1 # 84
 Kramer, Glen Teknovus, Inc.
 Comment Type T Comment Status D
 [Submitted on behalf of Eric Lynskey]
 Table 56-3 seems incorrect. It says that a 10GBASE-PR device must implement both
 Clause 64 and Clause 77.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Modify table to show that 10G symmetric devices only support Clause 77.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 56 **SC 56.1.3** **P54** **L 8** # **85**
 Kramer, Glen Teknovus, Inc.

Comment Type **E** **Comment Status** **D**
 [Submitted on behalf of Eric Lynskey]
 In the Clause 77 column it uses the acronym MPMCS. Is this correct?

SuggestedRemedy
 Change to MPMC.

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

Cl 56 **SC 56.1.3** **P57** **L 4** # **4**
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type **E** **Comment Status** **D**
 [Resubmitted from January 2009 meeting (see D2.2 comment #2794)]
 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."

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

Cl 56 **SC 56.1.3** **P58** **L 24** # **37**
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type **E** **Comment Status** **D**
 [Resubmitted from January 2009 meeting (see D2.2 comment #2884)]
 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

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

Cl 75 **SC 75.1** **P69** **L 428** # **32**
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type **T** **Comment Status** **D**
 [Resubmitted from January 2009 meeting (see D2.2 comment #2871)]
 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.

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**
 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 75.4** **P77** **L 22** # **86**
 Kramer, Glen Teknovus, Inc.

Comment Type **E** **Comment Status** **D** *There is there are*
 [Submitted on behalf of Eric Lynskey]
 Note that there is only two . . .

SuggestedRemedy
 Note that there are only two . . .

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

Cl 75 **SC 75.4.1** **P77** **L 22** # **45**
 Methley, Steven CONSULTANT

Comment Type **E** **Comment Status** **D** *There is there are*
 'There is..' should be 'There are..'

SuggestedRemedy
 Note that there are only two groups of transmit powers.

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 See comment #86.

CI 75 SC 75.4.1 P77 L22 # 130
Mandin, Jeff

Comment Type T Comment Status D PMD groups

The header of table 75-5 is in disagreement with the text on page 77 lines 22-25 (the grouping of transmitters).

[This comment is contained in the file attached to comment #68 and has been added to the database as a separate comment to make processing simpler]

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."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.
See comment #33.

CI 75 SC 75.4.1 P77 L23 # 2
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type E Comment Status D

[Resubmitted from January 2009 meeting (see D2.2 comment #2790)]

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.

Proposed Response Response Status W

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.

See 3av_0903_hajduczenia_2.pdf for details.

CI 75 SC 75.4.1 P77 L23 # 33
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type T Comment Status D PMD groups

[Resubmitted from January 2009 meeting (see D2.2 comment #2878)]

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."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

[Was "E", changed to "T"]

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 2325** # **17**
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type T **Comment Status D** **PMD groups**

[Resubmitted from January 2009 meeting (see D2.2 comment #2820)]
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"

Proposed Response **Response Status W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.
See comment #33.

Cl 75 **SC 75.4.1** **P77** **L 35** # **18**
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type T **Comment Status D**

[Resubmitted from January 2009 meeting (see D2.2 comment #2821)]
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

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

Cl 75 **SC 75.4.1** **P77** **L 45** # **131**
Mandin, Jeff

Comment Type T **Comment Status D**

Eye mask tables would be clearer with references
[This comment is contained in the file attached to comment #68 and has been added to the database as a separate comment to make processing simpler]

SuggestedRemedy
1. To the text "transmitter eye mask definition {X1, X2, X3, Y1, Y2, Y3}" add a footnote indicating "as defined in figure 75-8"
2. On page 81 line 41: To the text "transmitter eye mask definition {X1, X2, X3, Y1, Y2, Y3}" add a footnote indicating "as defined in figure 75-8"
3. On page 82, line 20: To the text "Transmitter eye mask definition {X1, X2, Y1, Y2, Y3}", add a footnote indicating "as defined in figure 75-7"

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

Cl 75 **SC 75.7.16** **P90** **L 25** # **105**
Kramer, Glen Teknovus, Inc.

Comment Type T **Comment Status D**

[Submitted on behalf of Eric Lynskey]
Does the reference to 60.7.13.2 provide clear enough instructions on how to perform this measurement? If you look at Clause 60, it talks about TP3 and TP4 instead of TP7 and TP8. It also talks about 8B/10B patterns instead of 64B/66B patterns.

SuggestedRemedy
If group feels reference is sufficient, no change is necessary. Otherwise, draft text that helps to clarify the differences between Clause 60 and Clause 75 measurements.

Proposed Response **Response Status W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Decision to be taken by TF. Proposed modifications to 75.7.16 are included in 3av_0903_hajduczenia_3.pdf. Changes to Figure 75-9 included in 3av_0903_hajduczenia_3.pdf might be needed as decided by TF.

Cl **75B** SC **75B.2.1** P**107** L**38** # **15**
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.
 Comment Type **T** Comment Status **D**
 [Resubmitted from January 2009 meeting (see D2.2 comment #2811)]
 The 10 Gb/s downstream transmission uses 1574-1580 nm.....
 SuggestedRemedy
 The 10 Gb/s downstream transmission uses 1575-1580 nm.....
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **75B** SC **75B.2.1** P**108** L**1** # **59**
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.
 Comment Type **T** Comment Status **D**
 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
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **75B** SC **75B.2.2** P**109** L**45** # **50**
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.
 Comment Type **ER** Comment Status **D**
 [Submitted on behalf of Runjian Lin]
 Text "An OLT ..downstream wavelength" is not regarding upstream transmission.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Move this two lines to Page 107, Line 39-40
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **75C** SC **75C.1** P**114** L**1** # **67**
 Dawe, Piers
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **D**
 Clause 75 ends with page 114 (blank) and Clause 76 starts with page 109.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Remove blank page and corrctet page numbering.
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **76** SC **0** P L # **126**
 Mandin, Jeff
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **D**
 There should be PICS for the encoder/decoder and scrambler/descrambler that are inherited from cl49
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 [changed fm cl 00 to cl 76]
 Copy 49.3.4.1 (C1 - C2 only) Coding rules and 49.3.4.2 (S1 - S2) Scrambler and Descrambler to PICS just before 76.5.4.4 Data detection.

CI 76 SC 76.1.1 P109 L43 # 66
Dawe, Piers

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Draft says "Code examples given in this clause adhere to the style of the "C" programming language.". Later on, fragments of pseudo-C are used to define functions: they are not just examples. But because they aren't complete or executable, one cannot be sure what is meant. Also they put an added burden on the reader: he has to understand technical English, Pascal, Matlab and 802.3 state diagrams already, and we should not impose a fifth foreign language without a compelling reason (by the way, Matlab is in the main a good example because it is so like the universal mathematical notation, not so foreign). Other projects didn't need to add a fifth language. It is not clear what happens if code and text appear to disagree. It is not clear what happens if different dialects of C could lead to different outcomes.

Annex 61A.3 is an interesting example; it's a complete program so one can run it to see if it really means what one thinks it does, and it really is an example, and it is in an informative annex, so actually it's not a show-stopper if a reader can't use it.

SuggestedRemedy

I believe you need to define the functions unambiguously and accessibly, in the combination of English and state diagrams which we already use. It may be helpful to collect up the pseudo-code fragments, replace any informal words with code, add top and tail and a bit more example code if necessary to join the pieces, and put the resulting executable program in an informative appendix. It would then follow that the normative text and diagrams take precedence according to the usual rules.
If you leave any "C" in the draft, state which version of C you mean.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

The task force has addressed this question already and determined that this method is acceptable.

CI 76 SC 76.1.2 P158 L20 # 42
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type T Comment Status D

[Resubmitted from January 2009 meeting (see D2.2 comment #2890)]
"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"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 76 SC 76.2.1 P109 L54 # 104
Kramer, Glen Teknovus, Inc.

Comment Type E Comment Status D

[Submitted on behalf of Eric Lynskey]
Page 109 follows page 114.

SuggestedRemedy

Renumber pages.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 76 SC 76.2.1 P115 L48 # 9
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type E Comment Status D

[Resubmitted from January 2009 meeting (see D2.2 comment #2800)]
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)."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 76 SC 76.2.2 P113 L4 # 132
Mandin, Jeff

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Terminology

[This comment is contained in the file attached to comment #68 and has been added to the database as a separate comment to make processing simpler]

SuggestedRemedy

Change:

"GMII is the interface used to transfer data between the MAC and the PHY"

"XGMII is the interface used to transfer data between the MAC and the PHY"

to:

"GMII is the interface used to transfer data between the RS and the PCS"

"XGMII is the interface used to transfer data between the RS and the PCS"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

While the suggested change is technically correct so is the original text. On the (conservative) assumption that less change is better at this point the comment is proposed rejected.

Cl 76 SC 76.2.2 P113 L9 # 133
Mandin, Jeff

Comment Type T Comment Status D

"Symmetric PON operation" _uses_ both directions of the MII. It doesn't "provide" the MII functionality.

[This comment is contained in the file attached to comment #68 and has been added to the database as a separate comment to make processing simpler]

SuggestedRemedy

Change:

"providing all of the functionality of the XGMII"

to:

"utilizing all of the functionality of the XGMII".

Change "providing" to "utilizing" on lines 11, 14, and 16 also.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 76 SC 76.2.2 P119 L4 # 25
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type T Comment Status D

[Resubmitted from January 2009 meeting (see D2.2 comment #2849)]

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."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 76 SC 76.2.2.1 P113 L22 # 134
Mandin, Jeff

Comment Type T Comment Status D

76.2.2.1 and 76.2.2.2 mostly repeat material from the previous subclause.

[This comment is contained in the file attached to comment #68 and has been added to the database as a separate comment to make processing simpler]

SuggestedRemedy

1. Delete the first two sentences of 76.2.2.1 and the first two sentences of 76.2.2.2

2. Change the final sentence of 76.2.2.1 from:

"Figure 76-3(a) depicts the operation of the 10/10G-EPON."

to:

"Figure 76-3(a) depicts the MII paths used in 10/10G-EPON."

3. Change the final sentence of 76.2.2.2 from:

"Figure 76-3(b) depicts the operation of the 10/1G-EPON."

to:

"Figure 76-3(b) depicts the MII paths used in 10/1G-EPON."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 76 SC 76.2.2.3 P113 L42 # 135
Mandin, Jeff

Comment Type T Comment Status D

wordsmithing

[This comment is contained in the file attached to comment #68 and has been added to the database as a separate comment to make processing simpler]

SuggestedRemedy

Change:
"the OLT may be configured to use a dual-rate mode"
to
"the OLT may optionally support dual-rate mode"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

The phrase is technically correct and does not require wordsmithing. On the (conservative) assumption that less change is better at this point the comment is proposed rejected.

Cl 76 SC 76.2.2.3 P113 L44 # 136
Mandin, Jeff

Comment Type T Comment Status D

"Figure 76-4 depicts the OLT operating in a dual-rate mode." is not quite right.
[This comment is contained in the file attached to comment #68 and has been added to the database as a separate comment to make processing simpler]

SuggestedRemedy

Change:
"Figure 76-4 depicts the OLT operating in a dual-rate mode."
to:
"Figure 76-4 depicts the MII paths used in an OLT operating in dual-rate mode."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 76 SC 76.2.2.3 P120 L1 # 21
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type E Comment Status D

[Resubmitted from January 2009 meeting (see D2.2 comment #2836)]
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"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 76 SC 76.2.2.4 P114 L50 # 137
Mandin, Jeff

Comment Type T Comment Status D

The only purpose of 76.2.2.4 seems to be to provide a summary of the contents of 76.2.6.
[This comment is contained in the file attached to comment #68 and has been added to the database as a separate comment to make processing simpler]

SuggestedRemedy

Delete 76.2.2.4

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 76 SC 76.2.3 P115 L9 # 138
Mandin, Jeff

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Stray sentence in RS text refers to 1G function of PCS.
[This comment is contained in the file attached to comment #68 and has been added to the database as a separate comment to make processing simpler]

SuggestedRemedy

Delete the sentence "The PCS in the OLT shall operate in unidirectional mode as defined in 66.2.2"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 76 SC 76.2.3.2 P121 L37 # 10
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type E Comment Status D

[Resubmitted from January 2009 meeting (see D2.2 comment #2801)]
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

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 76 SC 76.2.6 P116 L7 # 51
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type ER Comment Status D

[Submitted on behalf of Runjian Lin]
Location of Table 76-1, Table 76-2

SuggestedRemedy

Move to Page 115, Line 3 above 76.2.3

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.
These tables actually are associate with 76.2.6 not 76.2.2.4 (note subclause 76.2.2.4 is proposed to be removed in comment 137).

Cl 76 SC 76.2.6.1.2 P116 L49 # 139
Mandin, Jeff

Comment Type T Comment Status D

"The transmit function is described in 65.1.3.2 except as noted in Table 76-3 ..."
This would be confusing even if it were correct (and it doesn't seem to be).
[This comment is contained in the file attached to comment #68 and has been added to the database as a separate comment to make processing simpler]

SuggestedRemedy

Add appropriate sections and text to 76.2.6.1.2 describing the placement of LLID, computation of CRC etc.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.
Given the number of implementations of 1G-EPON that exist, it appears that the descriptions referenced in cl 65.1.3.2 are in fact not confusing.

Cl 76 SC 76.2.6.1.2 P116 L51 # 56
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

[Submitted on behalf of Runjian Lin]
RS Transmit function needs to be augmented for packet start control alignment

SuggestedRemedy

76.2.6.1.2 RS Transmit function
Add text "The Start control character alignment is described in 46.3.1.4 except as noted below.
The RS may maintain the effective data rate by sometimes inserting and sometimes deleting idle characters to align the Start control character. When using this method, the RS must maintain a Deficit Idle Count (DIC) that represents the cumulative count of idle characters deleted or inserted. DIC should be initialized to zero. A FIFO initialized to empty is needed for the packet alignment process."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.
I believe the method is identical to that described in cl 46.3 and no additional text is needed in our draft. At most we may wish to reference cl 46 here (as in "The XGMII transmit function is described in 46.3.1.")

Cl 76 SC 76.2.6.1.3 P123 L11 # 57
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type E Comment Status D locical

Typo "locical" in Column 1, lane 1 description says "<mode,locical_link_id[14:8]>"

SuggestedRemedy

Change "locical" to "logical"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 76 SC 76.2.6.1.3.3 P118 L25 # 140
Mandin, Jeff

Comment Type T Comment Status D

CRC-8 field handling is not the same here as in clause 65 - because the SFD field handling is different in 10G

[This comment is contained in the file attached to comment #68 and has been added to the database as a separate comment to make processing simpler]

SuggestedRemedy

Provide full text for this subclause.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

The comment author is encouraged to propose added text.

Cl 76 SC 76.3.1 P L # 141
Mandin, Jeff

Comment Type T Comment Status D

The c76 PCS is its own PCS type, and not an extension of another PCS.

[This comment is contained in the file attached to comment #68 and has been added to the database as a separate comment to make processing simpler]

SuggestedRemedy

1. Change:

"show the relationship between the extended PCS sublayer and the ISO/IEC OSI reference model"

to:

"show the relationship between the PCS sublayer and the ISO/IEC OSI reference model"

2. Remove the word "extension" from the titles of figures 76-7 and 76-8

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 76 SC 76.3.1 P118 L33 # 142
Mandin, Jeff

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Wordsmithing

[This comment is contained in the file attached to comment #68 and has been added to the database as a separate comment to make processing simpler]

SuggestedRemedy

1. Change

"supporting burst-mode operation of the point-to-multipoint physical medium"

to:

"supporting burst-mode operation over the point-to-multipoint physical medium"

2. Make the same change on page 119, line 40

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 76 SC 76.3.1.1 P118 L51 # 143
Mandin, Jeff

Comment Type T Comment Status D

"In this clause, no explicit specification is provided for the 10/1GBASE-PRX PCS. It is expected that deriving such a specification from 10GBASE-PR PCS and 1000BASE-PX PCS specifications as described above is a straightforward process."

Conveys the impression that we are leaving part of the spec as an exercise for the user to write.

[This comment is contained in the file attached to comment #68 and has been added to the database as a separate comment to make processing simpler]

SuggestedRemedy

Delete the second sentence so that the paragraph reads:

"In this clause, no explicit specification is provided for the 10/1GBASE-PRX PCS. "

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See response to comment 170

Cl 76 SC 76.3.2 P119 L43 # 144
Mandin, Jeff

Comment Type T Comment Status D

wordsmithing

[This comment is contained in the file attached to comment #68 and has been added to the database as a separate comment to make processing simpler]

SuggestedRemedy

Change:

"Figure 76-8 represents the functional block diagram"

to:

"Figure 76-8 shows the functional block diagram"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 76 SC 76.3.2 P125 L4648 # 16
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type E Comment Status D

[Resubmitted from January 2009 meeting (see D2.2 comment #2814)]

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).

Proposed Response Response Status W

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 P120 L37 # 145
Mandin, Jeff

Comment Type T Comment Status D

The IDLE deletion process doesn't actively ensure that minimum IPG is preserved.

Rather, it relies on MPCP to ensure that there is a sufficient number of excess IDLEs.

[This comment is contained in the file attached to comment #68 and has been added to the database as a separate comment to make processing simpler]

SuggestedRemedy

Change:

"This process deletes four 72-bit vectors containing Idle characters per every thirty-one 72-bit vectors received from the XGMII, always ensuring that the minimum IPG has been preserved between two adjacent packets."

to either:

a) "This process deletes four 72-bit vectors containing Idle characters per every thirty-one 72-bit vectors received from the XGMII."

b) "This process deletes four 72-bit vectors containing Idle characters per every thirty-one 72-bit vectors received from the XGMII. The MPCP layer ensures that sufficient Idle characters occur so that the minimum IPG is always preserved between two adjacent packets."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change to:

"This process deletes four 72-bit vectors containing Idle characters per every thirty-one 72-bit vectors received from the XGMII."

Cl 76 SC 76.3.2.1 P120 L40 # 146
Mandin, Jeff

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Terminology/Wordsmithing

[This comment is contained in the file attached to comment #68 and has been added to the database as a separate comment to make processing simpler]

SuggestedRemedy

Change:

"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"

to:

"The Idle Deletion function for ONUs is depicted in Figure 76-10 and the function for OLTs is depicted in Figure 76-9 "

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

The phrase is technically correct and does not require wordsmithing.

On the (conservative) assumption that less change is better at this point the comment is proposed rejected.

Cl 76 **SC 76.3.2.1** **P126** **L40** # **22**
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type E **Comment Status D**

[Resubmitted from January 2009 meeting (see D2.2 comment #2837)]
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."

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

Cl 76 **SC 76.3.2.1.1** **P121** **L1** # **87**
Kramer, Glen Teknovus, Inc.

Comment Type E **Comment Status D** *FEC_Psize def*

[Submitted on behalf of Eric Lynskey]
It's very confusing to have the figure in the middle of the definition of the constant.

SuggestedRemedy
Move figure so that it does not break the definition in half.

Proposed Response **Response Status W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Will attempt to fix in frame as long as heroics are not require.

Cl 76 **SC 76.3.2.1.1** **P127** **L1** # **58**
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type E **Comment Status D** *FEC_Psize def*

Figure 76-8 breaks the definition of FEC_Psize constant

SuggestedRemedy
Make sure that figures do not break blocks of text between different pages. Otherwise readability is lost.

Proposed Response **Response Status W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Will attempt to fix in frame as long as heroics are not require.

Cl 76 **SC 76.3.2.1.1** **P127** **L40** # **41**
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type T **Comment Status D**

[Resubmitted from January 2009 meeting (see D2.2 comment #2889)]
Constund IDLE_COLUMN is not used anywhere in the draft.

SuggestedRemedy
delete definition for this constant

Proposed Response **Response Status W**
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 76.3.2.1.3** **P112** **L16** # **52**
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type TR **Comment Status D**

[Submitted on behalf of Runjian Lin]
T_TYPE (rx_raw<71:0>)

SuggestedRemedy
T_TYPE(tx_raw<71:0>)

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

Cl 76 SC 76.3.2.1.5 P122 L36 # 147
Mandin, Jeff

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Wordsmithing

[This comment is contained in the file attached to comment #68 and has been added to the database as a separate comment to make processing simpler]

SuggestedRemedy

Change:

"The OLT PCS Idle Deletion function shall implement the state diagram as shown in Figure 76-9. The ONU PCS Idle Deletion function shall implement the state diagram as shown in Figure 76-10."

to:

"The OLT PCS shall perform Idle deletion as shown in Figure 76-9. The ONU PCS shall perform Idle Deletion as shown in Figure 76-10."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

A casual investigation indicates that both wordings are used in the standard (see 50.4 Synchronization state diagram).

On the (conservative) assumption that less change is better at this point the comment is proposed rejected.

Cl 76 SC 76.3.2.1.5 P130 L1 # 1
Kramer, Glen Teknovus, Inc.

Comment Type T Comment Status D

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)

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 76 SC 76.3.2.4.1 P131 L22 # 11
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type T Comment Status D

[Resubmitted from January 2009 meeting (see D2.2 comment #2803)]

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"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 76 SC 76.3.2.4.2 P127 L3 # 148
Mandin, Jeff

Comment Type T Comment Status D

terminology

[This comment is contained in the file attached to comment #68 and has been added to the database as a separate comment to make processing simpler]

SuggestedRemedy

1. On page 127 line 3, change:

"Padding of FEC codewords and appending FEC parity bytes in the 10GBASE-PR PCS transmitter is illustrated in figure 76-13"

to:

"Padding of FEC codewords and appending FEC parity bytes in the 10GBASE-PR and 10/1GBASE-PRX OLT PCS transmitter is illustrated in figure 76-13"

2. On page 131 line 25, Change:

"pertinent to the 10GBASE-PR PCS transmitters"

to:

"pertinent to the 10GBASE-PR and 10/1GBASE-PRX OLT PCS transmitters"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 76 SC 76.3.2.4.2 P128 L11 # 149
Mandin, Jeff

Comment Type T Comment Status D

[This comment is contained in the file attached to comment #68 and has been added to the database as a separate comment to make processing simpler]

SuggestedRemedy

Modify figure 76-13 so that the 66b encoder is shown as a box (and not just mentioned in the label on the output arrow)

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
See proposal 3av_0903_remein_2.pdf
(remove highlights and hard coded figure number)

Cl 76 SC 76.3.2.5 P129 L13 # 150
Mandin, Jeff

Comment Type T Comment Status D

wordsmithing
[This comment is contained in the file attached to comment #68 and has been added to the database as a separate comment to make processing simpler]

SuggestedRemedy

Change:
"To control the laser, the ONU PCS is extended to detect the presence of transmitted data "
to:
"To control the laser, the ONU PCS includes a function to detect the presence of transmitted data"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 76 SC 76.3.2.5 P129 L18 # 151
Mandin, Jeff

Comment Type T Comment Status D

The descriptive text from the second paragraph of 76.3.2.5 through the second paragraph on 130 (data detector fifo mechanism) is outdated. So is figure 76-14.
[This comment is contained in the file attached to comment #68 and has been added to the database as a separate comment to make processing simpler]

SuggestedRemedy

Replace the indicated paragraphs and figure with up-to-date text.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.
The suggested remedy is incomplete. The comment author is encouraged to bring a complete suggestion to the meeting.

Cl 76 SC 76.3.2.5 P129 L18 # 152
Mandin, Jeff

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Terminology
[This comment is contained in the file attached to comment #68 and has been added to the database as a separate comment to make processing simpler]

SuggestedRemedy

1. Change:
"The Data Detector contains a delay line (FIFO buffer) storing code-groups to be transmitted."
to:
The Data Detector contains a delay line (FIFO buffer) storing 66-bit blocks to be transmitted.
2. Also change "code groups" to "66-bit blocks" in the PICS on page 156, line 40

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.
The phrasing is consistent with that in the standard (see 65.2.2.1 Principle of operation).

Cl 76 SC 76.3.2.5 P129 L 26 # 153
Mandin, Jeff

Comment Type T Comment Status D
wordsmithing
[This comment is contained in the file attached to comment #68 and has been added to the database as a separate comment to make processing simpler]

SuggestedRemedy

Change:
"The Idle control characters are used to synchronize the scrambler and start of packet delineation"
to:
"The Idle control characters are used to synchronize the descrambler and establish start-of-packet delineation"

Proposed Response Response Status W
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 76 SC 76.3.2.5 P129 L 40 # 88
Kramer, Glen Teknovus, Inc.

Comment Type E Comment Status D Figure 76-14
[Submitted on behalf of Eric Lynskey]
It is very difficult to see the difference in shading between Data and FEC.

SuggestedRemedy

Use more obvious shading to differentiate between data and FEC.

Proposed Response Response Status W
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
See resolution to comment 93

Cl 76 SC 76.3.2.5 P129 L 47 # 93
Kramer, Glen Teknovus, Inc.

Comment Type T Comment Status D Figure 76-14
[Submitted on behalf of Eric Lynskey]
Figure 76-14 is confusing, incorrect, and is not as clear as Figure 76-15.

SuggestedRemedy

Remove figure from draft.

Proposed Response Response Status W
PROPOSED ACCEPT.
Remove any references also.

Cl 76 SC 76.3.2.5 P129 L 47 # 92
Kramer, Glen Teknovus, Inc.

Comment Type T Comment Status D Figure 76-14
[Submitted on behalf of Eric Lynskey]
Figure 76-14 shows data beginning immediately after syncTime. In a burst, however, data will not begin until two IDLE blocks have been transmitted.

SuggestedRemedy

Add IDLE block after syncTime is done and before data.

Proposed Response Response Status W
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
See resolution to comment 93

Cl 76 SC 76.3.2.5 P130 L 43 # 154
Mandin, Jeff

Comment Type E Comment Status D
No need for refer to figure 76-15 since the whole paragraph is describing the figure.
[This comment is contained in the file attached to comment #68 and has been added to the database as a separate comment to make processing simpler]

SuggestedRemedy

Delete "(See figure 76-15)"

Proposed Response Response Status W
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 76 SC 76.3.2.5 P130 L45 # 155
Mandin, Jeff

Comment Type T Comment Status D
wordsmithing
[This comment is contained in the file attached to comment #68 and has been added to the database as a separate comment to make processing simpler]

SuggestedRemedy
Change:
"When received at the OLT, the BURST_DELIMITER allows for FEC codeword alignment on the incoming data stream..."
to:
"When received at the OLT, the BURST_DELIMITER is used for FEC codeword alignment on the incoming data stream ..."

Proposed Response Response Status W
PROPOSED REJECT.
The two statements are functionally equivalent.
On the (conservative) assumption that less change is better at this point the comment is proposed rejected.

Cl 76 SC 76.3.2.5 P130 L46 # 156
Mandin, Jeff

Comment Type T Comment Status D
Terminology
[This comment is contained in the file attached to comment #68 and has been added to the database as a separate comment to make processing simpler]

SuggestedRemedy
Change:
"provide IPG at the OLT"
to:
"provide packet delineation at the RS layer of the OLT".

Proposed Response Response Status W
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 76 SC 76.3.2.5 P135 L3349 # 19
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type T Comment Status D
[Resubmitted from January 2009 meeting (see D2.2 comment #2823)]
In Figure 76-14, there is no EOB after data and FEC.

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

Proposed Response Response Status W
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 76 SC 76.3.2.5 P137 L19 # 38
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type T Comment Status D
[Resubmitted from January 2009 meeting (see D2.2 comment #2886)]
"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.

Proposed Response Response Status W
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 76 SC 76.3.2.5.6 P135 L1 # 157
Mandin, Jeff

Comment Type T Comment Status D

A "data detector" state diagram is provided for the OLT.
But the OLT data detector does not appear in the stack diagram in figure 76-7.
Also it does not detect data.
Moreover the title of 76.3.2.5.6 says "(ONU only)"
[This comment is contained in the file attached to comment #68 and has been added to the database as a separate comment to make processing simpler]

SuggestedRemedy

Either:
a) modify figure 76-7, the title of 76.3.2.5.6, and the name of the data detector so that the OLT function is described properly.
b) create a new section "State Diagrams" in the FEC encoder subclause 76.3.2.4 and move figure 76-17 and 76-18a into it with the name "FEC encoding process "

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
While it is clear that the title of 76.3.2.5.6 does not say "(ONU only)" the point is valid.
Figure 76-7 should be updated as shown in 3av_0903_remein_3.pdf.
(remove highlights and hard coded figure number)

Cl 76 SC 76.3.3.1.1 P143 L4 # 99
Kramer, Glen Teknovus, Inc.

Comment Type T Comment Status D

[Submitted on behalf of Eric Lynskey]
Incorrect reference.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace 76.3.3.1.1 with 76.3.3.1.2.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.
[changed subclause from 76.3.3.1.1 to 76.3.3.2.3]

Cl 76 SC 76.3.3.1.3 P139 L1 # 158
Mandin, Jeff

Comment Type E Comment Status D

[This comment is contained in the file attached to comment #68 and has been added to the database as a separate comment to make processing simpler]

SuggestedRemedy

Change "BlockFromPMA" to "BlockFromPMA()"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.
See resolution to comment 72

Cl 76 SC 76.3.3.2 P140 L46 # 159
Mandin, Jeff

Comment Type T Comment Status D

"Shall" without a PICS.
Probably sufficient for the text to have a "shall"/PICS on the transmit bit order and not have "shall"/PICS on the receive bit order.
Also do some wordsmithing.
[This comment is contained in the file attached to comment #68 and has been added to the database as a separate comment to make processing simpler]

SuggestedRemedy

Change:
"The synchronizer shall form a bit stream from the primitives by concatenating requests with the bits of each primitive in order from rx_data-group<0> to rx_data-group<15> (see Figure 76-20).
to:
"The synchronizer forms an incoming bit stream by concatenating the bits from each successive indication primitive (see Figure 76-20)."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Change to:
"The synchronizer forms a bit stream from the primitives by concatenating requests with the bits of each primitive in order from rx_data-group<0> to rx_data-group<15> (see Figure 76-20)."

CI 76 SC 76.3.3.2 P140 L48 # 160
Mandin, Jeff

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Wrong primitive

[This comment is contained in the file attached to comment #68 and has been added to the database as a separate comment to make processing simpler]

SuggestedRemedy

Change:

"The codeword synchronization function receives data via the 16-bit PMA_UNITDATA.request primitive"

to:

"The codeword synchronization function receives data via the 16-bit PMA_UNITDATA.indication primitive"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 76 SC 76.3.3.2 P140 L53 # 161
Mandin, Jeff

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Redundant sentence

[This comment is contained in the file attached to comment #68 and has been added to the database as a separate comment to make processing simpler]

SuggestedRemedy

Delete the sentence:

"Lock is obtained as specified in the codeword lock state diagram shown in Figure 76-21" since it is not descriptive and it appears again with a "shall" in 76.3.3.2.5

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

Said text is not redundant and does not appear in 76.3.3.2.5.

CI 76 SC 76.3.3.2 P141 L53 # 162
Mandin, Jeff

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Terminology/wordsmithing

[This comment is contained in the file attached to comment #68 and has been added to the database as a separate comment to make processing simpler]

SuggestedRemedy

change:

"The state diagram performs a search for this pattern, and when it finds a perfect match of two full codewords (62 blocks), it then asserts codeword lock."

to:

"The ONU synchronizer attempts to identify this pattern in the received datastream, and when it finds a perfect match of two full codewords (62 blocks), it then asserts codeword lock."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change to:

"The synchronizer performs a search for this pattern, and when it finds a perfect match of two full codewords (62 blocks), it then asserts codeword lock." (replace "state diagram" with "synchronizer")

Cl 76 SC 76.3.3.2 P142 L1 # 163
Mandin, Jeff

Comment Type T Comment Status D

wordsmithing

[This comment is contained in the file attached to comment #68 and has been added to the database as a separate comment to make processing simpler]

SuggestedRemedy

Change:

"When in codeword lock, the state diagram accumulates the appropriate contents of the 31 blocks that constitute a codeword in an input buffer. When the codeword is complete, the FEC decoder is triggered, and the input buffer is freed for the next codeword."

to:

"While in codeword lock, the synchronizer copies the FEC-protected bits from each data block of the codeword into an input buffer. When a complete codeword has been received, the FEC decoder is triggered, and the input buffer is freed for the next codeword."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change:

"When in codeword lock, the state diagram accumulates the appropriate contents of the 31 blocks that constitute a codeword in an input buffer."

to:

"While in codeword lock, the synchronizer copies the FEC-protected bits from each data block of the codeword into an input buffer."

Cl 76 SC 76.3.3.2.3 P143 L3 # 94
Kramer, Glen Teknovus, Inc.

Comment Type T Comment Status D

[Submitted on behalf of Eric Lynskey]
Incorrect reference.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to 76.3.3.1.2.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 76 SC 76.3.3.3 P143 L36 # 164
Mandin, Jeff

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Wordsmithing

[This comment is contained in the file attached to comment #68 and has been added to the database as a separate comment to make processing simpler]

SuggestedRemedy

Change:

"The 10/10G-EPON links shall use the Reed-Solomon code (255, 223) for FEC decoding in both upstream and downstream directions. The 10/1G-EPON shall use the Reed-Solomon (255, 223) code for FEC decoding in the downstream direction."

to:

"10/10G-EPON OLTs and ONUs shall correct the received datastream using the Reed-Solomon code (255, 223). 10/1G-EPON ONUs shall correct the received datastream using the Reed-Solomon (255, 223) code."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

The phrase is technically correct and does not require wordsmithing.

On the (conservative) assumption that less change is better at this point the comment is proposed rejected.

Cl 76 SC 76.3.3.3 P143 L39 # 165
Mandin, Jeff

Comment Type T Comment Status D

FEC decoder text should distinguish between FEC decoding process which invokes the FEC decoder and the FEC decoder itself.
[This comment is contained in the file attached to comment #68 and has been added to the database as a separate comment to make processing simpler]

SuggestedRemedy

1. Change title of 76.3.3.3 from "FEC Decoder" to "FEC Decoding Process"
2. On page 143, line 39 Change:
"The decoder then forwards the 66-bit data blocks to the descrambler and discards the parity blocks."
to:
"The decoding process then forwards the 66-bit data blocks to the descrambler and discards the parity blocks."
3. On line 40. change:
"The FEC decoder is also responsible for setting bit 0 of the sync header to the inverse of bit 1 of the sync header."
to:
"The FEC decoding process is also responsible for setting bit 0 of the forwarded sync header to the inverse of bit 1 of the corrected sync header."
4. On line 42, change "FEC decoder state diagram" to "FEC codeword processing state diagram"
5. One page 145 line 5, 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. If this option is set to be true, the FEC decoder checks for the value of decode_success."
to:
"The FEC decoding process provides a user option to indicate an uncorrectable FEC block (due to an excess of symbols containing errors) to the PCS layer. If this option is set to be true, the FEC decoding process checks for the value of decode_success."

Proposed Response Response Status W
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 76 SC 76.3.3.3 P143 L43 # 95
Kramer, Glen Teknovus, Inc.

Comment Type E Comment Status D

[Submitted on behalf of Eric Lynskey]
Referenced state diagram is FEC codeword processing, not FEC-decoder. Also on page 146 line 34.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to FEC codeword processing state diagram.

Proposed Response Response Status W
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 76 SC 76.3.3.3 P145 L1 # 96
Kramer, Glen Teknovus, Inc.

Comment Type E Comment Status D

[Submitted on behalf of Eric Lynskey]
Is there a need to reference all 4 subclauses? Only 45.3.4.32 contains information on the counter talked about here.

SuggestedRemedy

Change reference to only be 45.2.3.32.

Proposed Response Response Status W
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 76 SC 76.3.3.3 P145 L7 # 97
Kramer, Glen Teknovus, Inc.

Comment Type T Comment Status D

[Submitted on behalf of Eric Lynskey]
The variable decode_success is a boolean, and can only take on values of True or False. It cannot take on a value of 0.

SuggestedRemedy

If the variable decode_success is set to FALSE . . .

Proposed Response Response Status W
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 76 SC 76.3.3.3 P147 L26 # 166
Mandin, Jeff

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Error in FEC codeword processing state diagram
[This comment is contained in the file attached to comment #68 and has been added to the database as a separate comment to make processing simpler]

SuggestedRemedy

Change exit condition for processing a newly arrived codeword from:
"i = FEC_DSize * decode_success"
to:
"i = FEC_DSize * decode_done"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 76 SC 76.3.3.3 P151 L5 # 7
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type E Comment Status D

[Resubmitted from January 2009 meeting (see D2.2 comment #2798)]
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.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 76 SC 76.3.3.3.4 P146 L29 # 167
Mandin, Jeff

Comment Type T Comment Status D

FEC decoding and Idle insertion are applicable to ONUs in PRX
[This comment is contained in the file attached to comment #68 and has been added to the database as a separate comment to make processing simpler]

SuggestedRemedy

1. On page 146, line 29 Change:
"The body of this subclause comprises state diagrams, including the associated definitions of variables, constants, and functions pertinent to the 10GBASE-PR PCS receivers."
to:
"The body of this subclause comprises state diagrams, including the associated definitions of variables, constants, and functions pertinent to the 10GBASE-PR PCS receivers and 10/1GBASE-PRX ONU PCS receivers."
2. Make the same change on 149, line 23

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.
[Changed Subclause from 76.3.3.7 to 76.3.3.4]

Cl 76 SC 76.3.3.4.1 P146 L51 # 98
Kramer, Glen Teknovus, Inc.

Comment Type T Comment Status D

[Submitted on behalf of Eric Lynskey]
Incorrect register reference.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to 3.80.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 76 **SC 76.3.3.4.1** **P147** **L 38** # **100**
 Kramer, Glen Teknovus, Inc.

Comment Type T **Comment Status D**
 [Submitted on behalf of Eric Lynskey]
 Incorrect register reference.

SuggestedRemedy
 Replace 3.74 with 3.80. Is it possible to have these as cross-references so they will update automatically if it changes in the future?

Proposed Response **Response Status W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Replace 3.74 with 3.80.
 Possibility of using hot links will be investigated.

Cl 76 **SC 76.3.3.4.4** **P154** **L 28** # **39**
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type T **Comment Status D**
 [Resubmitted from January 2009 meeting (see D2.2 comment #2887)]
 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

Proposed Response **Response Status W**
 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 76.3.3.7.1** **P149** **L 48** # **101**
 Kramer, Glen Teknovus, Inc.

Comment Type T **Comment Status D**
 [Submitted on behalf of Eric Lynskey]
 We have a good definition, in IDLE_VECTOR, for what a 72-bit vector containing IDLE is.
 We should use this definition.

SuggestedRemedy
 Change sentence to "Upon initialization, all elements of this array are filled with IDLE_VECTOR characters."

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

Cl 76 **SC 76.3.3.7.2** **P150** **L 8** # **168**
 Mandin, Jeff

Comment Type T **Comment Status D**
 rx_raw_in is coming from the 66b decoder not the XGMII.
 So there is no reason to describe formation of the vector from XGMII signals.
 [This comment is contained in the file attached to comment #68 and has been added to the database as a separate comment to make processing simpler]

SuggestedRemedy
 Change:
 "Vector received from the output of the 64B/66B decoder containing two successive XGMII transfers. RXC<0> through RXC<3> for the first transfer are placed in rx_raw<0> through rx_raw<3>, respectively. RXC<0> through RXC<3> for the second transfer are placed in rx_raw<4> through rx_raw<7>, respectively. RXD<0> through RXD<31> for the first transfer are placed in rx_raw<8> through rx_raw<39>, respectively. RXD<0> through RXD<31> for the second transfer are placed in rx_raw<40> through rx_raw<71>, respectively."
 to:
 "Vector received from the output of the 64B/66B decoder for eventual transfer over the XGMII"

Proposed Response **Response Status W**
 PROPOSED REJECT.
 The text provides useful information and context to the reader.

Cl 76 **SC 76.3.3.7.5** **P151** **L 27** # **169**
 Mandin, Jeff

Comment Type T **Comment Status D**
 The IDLE insertion state diagram assumes that there is a continuous stream of incoming data blocks. However if lock is lost (or was never attained to begin with) then the II fifo will drain and there will be nothing to write on the XGMII for the parity cycles.
 [This comment is contained in the file attached to comment #68 and has been added to the database as a separate comment to make processing simpler]

SuggestedRemedy
 Fix figure 76-24 so that the Idle Insertion process creates a continuous XGMII Rx data stream as shown in 3av_0309_mandin_1.pdf.

Proposed Response **Response Status W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 Use figure 76-24 from 3av_0903_remain_4.pdf
 (remove highlights and hard coded figure number)
 Add definition to Constants (76.3.3.7.1)
 "LBLOCK_R
 This constant is defined in 49.2.13.2.1"

Cl 76 **SC 76.4.2.1** **P152** **L 33** # **53**
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type **ER** **Comment Status** **D**
 [Submitted on behalf of Runjian Lin]
 in Figure 76-3 and Figure 75-4

SuggestedRemedy
 in Figure 75-3

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

Cl 76 **SC 76.4.2.1** **P152** **L 33** # **103**
 Kramer, Glen Teknovus, Inc.

Comment Type **T** **Comment Status** **D**
 [Submitted on behalf of Eric Lynskey]
 Figure 76-3 and Figure 75-4 are completely unrelated to this text.

SuggestedRemedy
 Replace with correct reference, possibly Figure 75-3.

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

Cl 76 **SC 76.4.2.1** **P152** **L 34** # **54**
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type **ER** **Comment Status** **D**
 [Submitted on behalf of Runjian Lin]
 when the phase is recovered

SuggestedRemedy
 when the signal phase is recovered

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

Cl 76 **SC 76.4.2.1.1** **P152** **L 43** # **102**
 Kramer, Glen Teknovus, Inc.

Comment Type **E** **Comment Status** **D**
 [Submitted on behalf of Eric Lynskey]
 There is no Figure 75.5.15.

SuggestedRemedy
 Remove word Figure.

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

Cl 76 **SC 76.4.2.1.1** **P152** **L 44** # **106**
 Kramer, Glen Teknovus, Inc.

Comment Type **T** **Comment Status** **D**
 [Submitted on behalf of Eric Lynskey]
 In the previous subclause we reference 75.7.16 instead of referencing 60.7.13.2 directly.

SuggestedRemedy
 Replace 60.7.13.2 with 75.7.16.

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

Cl 76 SC 76.5.4 P154 L29 # 170
Mandin, Jeff

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Some of the PICS statements apply only to PR and not PRX
[This comment is contained in the file attached to comment #68 and has been added to the database as a separate comment to make processing simpler]

SuggestedRemedy

Modify the PICS proforma to appropriately distinguish between PR and PRX.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Subclause 76.3.1.1 clearly indicates our intention not to do this:
"In this clause, no explicit specification is provided for the 10/1GBASE-PRX PCS. It is expected that deriving such a specification from 10GBASE-PR PCS and 1000BASE-PX PCS specifications as described above is a straightforward process."
Obviously this appears to late in the clause and should be moved to the overview section.

Move subclause 76.3.1.1 to a new subclause 76.1.2

Modify as shown below:

"Conceptually, the 10/1GBASE-PRX RS, PCS and PMA represents a combination of transmit and receive functions defined in the 10GBASE-PR RS, PCS and PMA (specified in this clause) and the 1000BASE-PX RS, PCS and PMA (specified in Clause 65). At the OLT, the 10/1GBASE-PRX consists of the 10GBASE-PR transmit function and the 1000BASE-PX receive function (see Figure 76-5). Reciprocally, at the ONU, the 10/1GBASE-PRX consists of the 10GBASE-PR receive function and the 1000BASE-PX transmit function (see Figure 76-6)."

"In this clause, no explicit specification is provided for the 10/1GBASE-PRX RS, PCS and PMA. The RS, PCS and PMA components of a 10/1GBASE-PRX link will be compliant to the 10GBASE-PR specifications for 10 Gb/s operations and compliant to the 1000BASE-PX PCS specifications for 1 Gb/s operations."

Also see related comment 143.

Cl 76A SC 76A.1 P159 L29 # 107
Kramer, Glen Teknovus, Inc.

Comment Type E Comment Status D

[Submitted on behalf of Eric Lynskey]
The hyperlink provided in the footnote does not contain anything. It appears only to be a placeholder.

SuggestedRemedy

Upload tables to the web page.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The task force chair will sit with the working group chair and something might be accomplished and changes to the draft may occur.

Cl 77 SC 77 P171 L1 # 108
Kramer, Glen Teknovus, Inc.

Comment Type E Comment Status D

[Submitted on behalf of Eric Lynskey]
Page numbers jump from 164 to 171.

SuggestedRemedy

Renumber pages.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 77 SC 77.1.3 P176 L47 # 70
Law, David 3Com

Comment Type E Comment Status D

Mac' should read 'MAC'.

SuggestedRemedy

See comment.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 77 SC 77.1.3 P176 L49 # 69
Law, David 3Com

Comment Type T Comment Status D

In Figure 77-4, is 'MCF' really the 'interface to MAC Control client' as stated in the note at the bottom of the figure. The interface is MCF:MA_DATA but MA_DATA is the interface to the MAC Client. The interface to the MAC Control Client is MA_CONTROL.

SuggestedRemedy

Change 'MCF=interface to MAC Control client' to read 'MCF=interface to MAC client'.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

See 3av_0903_hajduczenia_1.pdf for proposed changes.

Cl 77 SC 77.1.3 P176 L5 # 71
Law, David 3Com

Comment Type T Comment Status D

The upper dotted line marked as 'MAC Control service interface' is really two separate service interfaces.

SuggestedRemedy

The upper dotted line should be broken in two, the MCF:MA_DATA.indication(...) and MCF:MA_DATA.request(...) primitives should be marked as 'MAC data service interface', the MA_CONTROL.request(...) and MA_CONTROL.indication(...) primitives should be marked as 'MAC Control client service interfaces'. Two boxes should be added, one labeled 'MAC Client' and the other 'MAC Control Client'. For example see Figure 57-2 'OAM sublayer support of interlayer service interfaces'.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

See 3av_0903_hajduczenia_1.pdf for proposed changes.

Cl 77 SC 77.2.2.1 P183 L12 # 109
Kramer, Glen Teknovus, Inc.

Comment Type T Comment Status D

[Submitted on behalf of Eric Lynskey]

The size of minimum IPG is not described in 36.2.4.14. This reference was carried over from Clause 64 and specifies size of EPD.

SuggestedRemedy

Change reference to 46.3.1.4 and also possibly add reference to 4A.4.2.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change reference to 46.3.1.4 and add reference to 4A.4.2.

Cl 77 SC 77.2.2.1 P183 L51 # 55
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type ER Comment Status D

[Submitted on behalf of Runjian Lin]
resets to zero (..) initialized to zero

SuggestedRemedy

is reset to zero (..) is initialized to zero

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 77 SC 77.2.2.2 P183 L30 # 111
Kramer, Glen Teknovus, Inc.

Comment Type T Comment Status D

[Submitted on behalf of Eric Lynskey]
Figure 77-14 is the Control Multiplexer.

SuggestedRemedy

Change reference to Figure 77-12.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 77 SC 77.2.2.2 P183 L30 # 110
Kramer, Glen Teknovus, Inc.

Comment Type T Comment Status D

[Submitted on behalf of Eric Lynskey]

Subclause 76.2.3.2 does not talk about the accuracy of the receive clock. In Clause 64, the reference added to this variable was to the loop timing specification.

SuggestedRemedy

Change reference to 76.4.1.2.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 77 SC 77.2.2.3 P183 L 36 # 14
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type T Comment Status D
[Resubmitted from January 2009 meeting (see D2.2 comment #2807)]
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"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Delete definition of alignmentCorrect.

Cl 77 SC 77.2.2.4 P201 L 39 # 36
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type T Comment Status D
[Resubmitted from January 2009 meeting (see D2.2 comment #2881)]
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.
$$\text{FEC_Overhead}(\text{length}) = \text{ceiling}((\text{fecOffset} + \text{length}) / \text{FEC_PAYLOAD_SIZE}) * \text{FEC_CODEWORD_SIZE} - \text{fecOffset}$$

Proposed Response Response Status W

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

Cl 77 SC 77.2.2.7 P190 L 41 # 13
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type T Comment Status D
[Resubmitted from January 2009 meeting (see D2.2 comment #2805)]
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

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
1) Use FEC_Overhead formula given in bullet 2, slide 4 of 3av_0901_kramer_1.pdf
2) In Draft 3.0 page 186 delete the definition of "L" and accompanying text (lines 20-23).
3) delete note lines 26-27.

CI 77 SC 77.2.2.7 P190 L9 # 12
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type T Comment Status D

[Resubmitted from January 2009 meeting (see D2.2 comment #2804)]
 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

Proposed Response Response Status W

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 !=]

CI 77 SC 77.2.2.7 P191 L1 # 171
 Mandin, Jeff

Comment Type T Comment Status D

3av_0901_mandin_3.pdf showed that Deficit Idle Count does not impact the FEC overhead calculations performed by MPCP. 3av_0901_kramer_1.pdf provided simulation results that indicated that this was the case on the downstream but there was indeed an impact of DIC on the upstream only. With additional investigation, we see that it is possible to use the same simple overhead calculation on both upstream and downstream - provided that we ensure the DIC value is 0 at start of burst. [This comment is contained in the file attached to comment #68 and has been added to the database as a separate comment to make processing simpler]

SuggestedRemedy

Modify figure 77-14 as indicated in 3av_0903_mandin_2.pdf

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 77 SC 77.2.2.7 P191 L 29 # 34
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type T Comment Status D

[Resubmitted from January 2009 meeting (see D2.2 comment #2879)]

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.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Accept Option #3 as shown on slides 7 & 8 from 3av_0901_mandin_5.pdf

CI 77 SC 77.3.3.1 P197 L 34 # 113
 Kramer, Glen Teknovus, Inc.

Comment Type T Comment Status D

[Submitted on behalf of Eric Lynskey]

The laserOnTimeCapability definition has cut and paste errors from the laserOffTimeCapability constant.

SuggestedRemedy

Change to ". . . time required to initialize the laser". Also change to ". . . time period required for turning on the PMD"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 77 SC 77.3.3.2 P198 L 13 # 90
 Kramer, Glen Teknovus, Inc.

Comment Type T Comment Status D

[Submitted on behalf of Eric Lynskey]

The term laserOffTime is not mentioned in 75.7.15, but the term Toff is used there.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace with "as specified by the value of Toff in 75.7.15."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

[changed From Clause 76 Subclause 76.3.3.2 to Clause 77 Subclause 77.3.3.2]

Cl 77 SC 77.3.3.2 P198 L16 # 114
Kramer, Glen Teknovus, Inc.

Comment Type T Comment Status D laseron/off

[Submitted on behalf of Eric Lynskey]

During a Discovery window, it is advantageous to allow as many ONUs the chance to register as possible. One way to do this is to attempt to reduce the number of collisions. If the default value of laserOnTime is set to laserOnTimeCapability instead of 512ns, this could significantly reduce the transmission time for each ONU during a discovery window. The value of laserOnTime will then be updated when the ONU is registered. Similarly, the default value of laserOffTime should be set to laserOffTimeCapability. If a laser supports an on time of 5 TQ, there is no need to turn the laser on for 32 TQ during this period. If a laser supports laser on time and off time of 5TQ each, it would reduce the transmission window by 864ns. This is a significant portion of the entire transmission window.

SuggestedRemedy

Change default value for laserOnTime to laserOnTimeCapability for ONU. Change default value of laserOffTime to laserOffTimeCapability for ONU.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 77 SC 77.3.3.2 P198 L19 # 91
Kramer, Glen Teknovus, Inc.

Comment Type T Comment Status D

[Submitted on behalf of Eric Lynskey]

The term laserOnTime is not mentioned in 75.7.15, but the term Ton is used there.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace with "as specified by the value of Ton in 75.7.15."

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

[changed From Clause 76 Subclause 76.3.3.2 to Clause 77 Subclause 77.3.3.2]

Cl 77 SC 77.3.3.2 P198 L49 # 89
Kramer, Glen Teknovus, Inc.

Comment Type T Comment Status D

[Submitted on behalf of Eric Lynskey]

Incorrect reference to 76.3.3.5.

SuggestedRemedy

Replace with correct reference.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

[changed From Clause 76 Subclause 76.3.3.2 to Clause 77 Subclause 77.3.3.2]

Replace indicated reference (76.3.3.5) with 76.3.2.5

Cl 77 SC 77.3.3.5 P201 L27 # 40
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type T Comment Status D laseron/off

[Resubmitted from January 2009 meeting (see D2.2 comment #2888)]

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

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #114.

Cl 77 **SC 77.3.3.6** **P202** **L 31** # **35**
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type T **Comment Status D**

[Resubmitted from January 2009 meeting (see D2.2 comment #2880)]
 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).

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

Cl 77 **SC 77.3.3.6** **P205** **L 22** # **112**
 Kramer, Glen Teknovus, Inc.

Comment Type E **Comment Status D**

[Submitted on behalf of Eric Lynskey]
 In Figure 77-22, the transition from COMPLETE DISCOVERY to VERIFY ACK is somewhat obscured.

SuggestedRemedy

Move text box slightly to the left.

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

Cl 99 **SC 99** **P2** **L 5** # **60**
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type T **Comment Status D**

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

SuggestedRemedy

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

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