

Cl 00 SC 0 P L # 9
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.
 Comment Type E Comment Status D True/FALSE
 [Submitted on behalf of Duane Remein]
 Inconsistent use of boolean "false" (sometimes "FALSE")
 SuggestedRemedy
 globally replace (whole word) "false" with "FALSE"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 [The comment is against unchanged text, therefore is outside the scope of this
 recirculation ballot]

Cl 00 SC 0 P 0 L 0 # 12
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.
 Comment Type E Comment Status D
 [Submitted on behalf of Duane Remein]
 Revision Tables (Editors' Note cl-2)
 SuggestedRemedy
 Remove Revision Tables from individual clauses and add to frontmatter just after existing
 Editor's Note. Use table from 3av_0905_remein_1.pdf
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 00 SC 0 P 98 L 15 # 54
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.
 Comment Type E Comment Status D
 [Submitted on behalf of Piers Dawe]
 In RINxOMA, shouldn't the x be subscript? If it messes up the contents, leave it to staff
 editor.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED REJECT.
 Page number and line do not correlate to either the plain or the diff draft.

Cl 01 SC 1.3 P 21 L 4 # 2
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D
 [Submitted on behalf of Pete Anslow]
 This says "Insert after ITU-T Recommendation G.9752" but G.9752 does not exist in the
 base document.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change "G.9752" to "G.975"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 01 SC 1.4.95 P 21 L 42 # 1
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D
 [Submitted on behalf of Pete Anslow]
 The base document text starts "As used in IEEE 802.3 Clause 38 for fiber optic links."
 Hence, "Clause 38" should be shown in strikethrough font.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change "IEEE 802.3" to "IEEE 802.3 Clause 38" with "Clause 38" shown in strikethrough
 font
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 [The comment is against unchanged text, therefore is outside the scope of this
 recirculation ballot]

Cl 01 SC 1.5 P 22 L 11 # 18
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.
 Comment Type T Comment Status D
 Definition of EOB is plain old strange. END_BURST_DELIMITER without reference to
 proper definition means nothing. Remove it together with brackets.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change definition of EOB to read "EOB<tab>end of burst delimiter"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 [The comment is against unchanged text, therefore is outside the scope of this
 recirculation ballot]

Cl 01 **SC 1.5** **P 22** **L 12** # **19**
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type **ER** **Comment Status** **D**
EPON = Ethernet Passive Optical Network. Strike "s" at the end of the acronym expansion.

SuggestedRemedy
Per comment.

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.
[The comment is against unchanged text, therefore is outside the scope of this recirculation ballot]
See resolution to comment #38

Cl 01 **SC 1.5** **P 22** **L 13** # **38**
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type **T** **Comment Status** **D**
[Submitted on behalf of Piers Dawe]
OUI can be singular

SuggestedRemedy
Identifiers should be Identifier. Not sure about Networks.

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
[The comment is against unchanged text, therefore is outside the scope of this recirculation ballot]
Change "Identifiers" to "Identifier" and "Networks" to "Network"

Cl 01 **SC 1.5** **P 22** **L 13** # **20**
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type **ER** **Comment Status** **D**
OUI = Organizationally Unique Identifier. Strike "s" at the end of the acronym expansion

SuggestedRemedy
Per comment.

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.
[The comment is against unchanged text, therefore is outside the scope of this recirculation ballot]
See resolution to comment #38

Cl 01 **SC 1.5** **P 22** **L 14** # **3**
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type **ER** **Comment Status** **D**
[Submitted on behalf of Pete Anslow]
The abbreviation "SCB single copy broadcast" is already in the 802.3 2008 standard

SuggestedRemedy
Remove the abbreviation "SCB single copy broadcast" from 1.4 of the .3av draft

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.
[The comment is against unchanged text, therefore is outside the scope of this recirculation ballot]

Cl 30 **SC 30.3.7.1.5** **P 27** **L 18** # **5**
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type **T** **Comment Status** **D** *Pg 27 In 18*
[Submitted on behalf of Duane Remein]
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 passes the CRC--8 check as defined in 65.1.3.3.3 or 76.2.6.1.3.3, as appropriate.;" which is does not match the current standard "A count of frames received that contain a valid SLD field in an OLT, as defined in 65.1.3.3.1, and pass the CRC-8 check, as defined in 65.1.3.3.3.;"

SuggestedRemedy
Change to "A count of frames received that contain a valid SLD field in an OLT, as defined in 65.1.3.3.1 or 76.2.6.1.3.1, as appropriate, and pass the CRC-8 check, as defined in 65.1.3.3.3.;" underline the phrase " or 76.2.6.1.3.1, as appropriate" to indicate changed text.

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.
The proposed wording better matches the current standard as compared to the wording in comments 14 or 39.

Cl 30 **SC 30.3.7.1.5** **P 27** **L 19** # **39**
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type T **Comment Status D** *Pg 27 In 18*

[Submitted on behalf of Piers Dawe]
In the following: 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 passes the CRC-8 check as defined in....

SuggestedRemedy
Should that be _and_ passes?

Proposed Response **Response Status W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
See response to comment #5 which aligns the text to the current standard.

Cl 30 **SC 30.3.7.1.5** **P 27** **L 19** # **14**
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type TR **Comment Status D** *Pg 27 In 18*

Badly implemented comment #63. The text says "but passes the CRC--8" while it should say "and passes the CRC--8". See 3av_0903_comments_d3_0_accepted.pdf from March meeting in Vancouver

SuggestedRemedy
Fix it accordingly

Proposed Response **Response Status W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
See response to comment #5 which aligns the text to the current standard.

Cl 30 **SC 30.3.7.1.7** **P 27** **L 38** # **29**
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type E **Comment Status D**

[Submitted on behalf of Seiji Kozaki]
Typo

SuggestedRemedy
Change "65.1.3.3.2 pr 76.2.6.1.3.2" to "65.1.3.3.2 or 76.2.6.1.3.2"

Proposed Response **Response Status W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.
[The comment is against unchanged text, therefore is outside the scope of this recirculation ballot]

Cl 30 **SC 30.5.1.1.2** **P 28** **L 34** # **102**
Kimura, Mitsunobu Hitachi Communicatio

Comment Type G **Comment Status D**

In the text, words "D1", "D2", "D3", "U1", "U2", "U3" are attached to their next words without space.

SuggestedRemedy
Add a space after the words.

Proposed Response **Response Status W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
[The comment is against unchanged text, therefore is outside the scope of this recirculation ballot]
In the source material there is actually a tab character. The style for the 6 paragraphs will be changed to ensure there is reasonable space between these words.

Cl 45 **SC 45.2.1** **P 37** **L 45** # **41**
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type T **Comment Status D** *ability/abilities*

[Submitted on behalf of Piers Dawe]
P2MP ability register should be 10G-EPON abilities register to match 45.2.1.11

SuggestedRemedy
Also should the reference be regular coloured not green?

Proposed Response **Response Status W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
[The comment is against unchanged text, therefore is outside the scope of this recirculation ballot]
There are 10 occurrences of "ability register" and only 5 occurrences of "abilities register" (outside TOC and discounting capitalization). Change 5 instances of "abilities register" to "ability register" using care to follow IEEE Style guide wrt capitalization (Pg 40 In 45, 47, 48 & 49, Pg 41 Ln 1).
Remove forest green font as this is a live link.

CI 45 SC 45.2.1.10 P 40 L 4 # 42
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type E Comment Status D ability/abilities

[Submitted on behalf of Piers Dawe]
Registers in 45 have minimal capitals.

SuggestedRemedy

This should be "PMA/PMD extended ability register" (as it is twice in the base document just above) - bug in base document

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.
[The comment is against unchanged text, therefore is outside the scope of this recirculation ballot]

CI 45 SC 45.2.1.11 P 40 L 45 # 43
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type E Comment Status D ability/abilities

[Submitted on behalf of Piers Dawe]
10G-EPON PMA/PMD Abilities Register should be 10G-EPON PMA/PMD abilities register (several occurrences)

SuggestedRemedy

Per comment

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
[The comment is against unchanged text, therefore is outside the scope of this recirculation ballot]
See resolution to comment #41

CI 45 SC 45.2.1.6.1 P 39 L 40 # 4
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type ER Comment Status D

[Submitted on behalf of Pete Anslow]
Clause 45.2.1.6.1 has the number in the clause title twice

SuggestedRemedy

Delete one occurrence of 45.2.1.6.1

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.
See resolution to comment #15

CI 45 SC 45.2.1.6.1 P 39 L 40 # 15
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type E Comment Status D

Two times "45.2.1.6.1"

SuggestedRemedy

Remove one of them

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 45 SC 45.2.3.29 P 43 L 42 # 44
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type T Comment Status D

[Submitted on behalf of Piers Dawe]
Was eliminating the FEC error indication ability bit a good idea? I see you want to make the FEC sync bit marking a mandatory feature. But isn't it usual to have an ability bit for a feature that has a control bit?

SuggestedRemedy

Consider reinstating the FEC error indication ability bit but always set to one, like the 10 Gb/s FEC ability bit.

I would have expected to see:

In the table: This bit indicates that the 10 Gb/s FEC decoder component of the PCS is able to indicate decoding errors to higher layers (mandatory for 10/1GBASE-PRX or 10GBASE-PR). In a 10/1GBASE-PRX OLT, this bit is undefined. and in 45.2.3.29.1 This bit indicates that the 10 Gb/s FEC decoder component of the 10GBASE-PR or 10/1GBASE-PRX PCS is able to indicate decoding errors to the higher layers (see 76.3.3.3). The bit always reads as one for 10/1GBASE-PRX or 10GBASE-PR. FEC error indication is controlled by a bit in the 10GBASE-PR and 10/1GBASE-PRX FEC control register (see 45.2.3.30.1).

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

The task force consider this question in the Vancouver 09 meeting and it was agreed to remove the FEC error indication ability bit.

CI 45 SC 45.2.3.30 P 44 L 10 # 50
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.
 Comment Type E Comment Status D
 [Submitted on behalf of Piers Dawe]Writes should be writes
 SuggestedRemedy
 Per comment
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 [The comment is against unchanged text, therefore is outside the scope of this recirculation ballot]

CI 45 SC 45.2.3.30 P 44 L 12 # 40
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.
 Comment Type E Comment Status D
 [Submitted on behalf of Piers Dawe]
 "enable FEC error indication" should be
 SuggestedRemedy
 Enable FEC error indication
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 [The comment is against unchanged text, therefore is outside the scope of this recirculation ballot]

CI 45 SC 45.2.3.30 P 44 L 18 # 45
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.
 Comment Type E Comment Status D
 [Submitted on behalf of Piers Dawe]
 RO Read only, R/W Read Write should be RO = Read only, R/W = Read/Write
 SuggestedRemedy
 Insert the equals signs
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 45 SC 45.2.3.31 P 44 L 43 # 103
 Kimura, Mitsunobu Hitachi Communicatio
 Comment Type G Comment Status D
 Index text of 45.2.3.31 shows 10GBASE-PR first and 10/1GBASE-PRX second. But main text shows 10/1GBASE-PRX first and 10GBASE -PR second.
 SuggestedRemedy
 Match the order of "10GBASE-PR" and "10/1GBASE-PRX" between index and body.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 45 SC 45.2.3.32 P 45 L 16 # 104
 Kimura, Mitsunobu Hitachi Communicatio
 Comment Type G Comment Status D
 Index of 45.2.3.32 shows "10GBASE-PR FEC and 10/1GBASE-PRX uncorrected FEC codewords", but body text shows "10/1GBASE-PRX and 10GBASE-PR FEC uncorrected codewords".
 SuggestedRemedy
 Change the index to "10/1GBASE-PRX and 10GBASE-PR FEC uncorrected codewords".
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 45 SC 45.2.3.33 P 45 L 35 # 46
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.
 Comment Type E Comment Status D
 [Submitted on behalf of Piers Dawe]
 "BER Monitor Control register" should be "BER Monitor control register" (3 times)
 SuggestedRemedy
 Per comment
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 [The comment is against unchanged text, therefore is outside the scope of this recirculation ballot]
 (Pg 45 Ln 35, 37 & 42)

CI 45 SC 45.2.3.33 P 45 L 38 # 49
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type T Comment Status D

[Submitted on behalf of Piers Dawe]

Registers are always there, whether the features are supported or not. Placement of only.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "This register is only required when 10GBASE-PR or 10/1GBASE-PRX ONU capability is supported" to "This register is defined only if 10GBASE-PR or 10/1GBASE-PRX ONU capability is supported.." Similarly in 45.2.3.34

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

[The comment is against unchanged text, therefore is outside the scope of this recirculation ballot]

Implementations (for example 100BASE-T implementations) may reasonable be expected not to support the register if it is not needed. The wording is correct as is.

CI 45 SC 45.2.3.33 P 45 L 48 # 47
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type E Comment Status D

[Submitted on behalf of Piers Dawe]

Too much text in the table

SuggestedRemedy

The explanation "A value of 0 indicates that the BER monitor function is disabled." and the default values should be given in the text at line 40, not in the table.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

The Editor respectfully disagrees with this opinion.

CI 45 SC 45.2.3.33 P 45 L 51 # 48
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type E Comment Status D

[Submitted on behalf of Piers Dawe]

microseconds should be us (with Greek omicron)

SuggestedRemedy

twice

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

Use of the full word is equally clear, if not more so.

CI 45 SC 45.2.3.34 P 46 L 4 # 51
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type E Comment Status D

[Submitted on behalf of Piers Dawe]

Table 45-111's title has "bit definitions" while Table 45-112 doesn't. Capitals. Missing a "Monitor".

SuggestedRemedy

Change to:

45.2.3.34 10GBASE-PR and 10/1GBASE-PRX BER Monitor status register (Register 3.81)

The assignments of bits in the 10GBASE-PR and 10/1GBASE-PRX BER Monitor status register is shown in Table 45-112. Table 45-112-10GBASE-PR and 10/1GBASE-PRX BER Monitor status register bit definitions

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

[The comment is against unchanged text, therefore is outside the scope of this recirculation ballot]

Change from:

"45.2.3.34 10GBASE-PR and 10/1GBASE-PRX BER Monitor Status (Register 3.81)"

"The assignments of bits in the 10GBASE-PR and 10/1GBASE-PRX BER Status Register is shown in Table 45-112. This register ..."

"Table 45-112—10GBASE-PR and 10/1GBASE-PRX BER Monitor Status Register"

To:

"45.2.3.34 10GBASE-PR and 10/1GBASE-PRX BER monitor status (Register 3.81)"

"The assignments of bits in the 10GBASE-PR and 10/1GBASE-PRX BER monitor status register is shown in Table 45-112. This register ..."

"Table 45-112—10GBASE-PR and 10/1GBASE-PRX BER monitor status register"

CI 66 SC 66.4.2.1 P 59 L 13 # 21
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type TR Comment Status D True/FALSE

I am confused with the use of "false" (37 references) and "FALSE" (29 references). Seems like it is not consistent within the clauses we modify / add. Pick one version and use it consistently in all clauses. The same is true for "true" and "TRUE". If there is any technical difference between lower caps and upper caps version of these words, state it. Otherwise align.

SuggestedRemedy

Per comment.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

[The comment is against unchanged text, therefore is outside the scope of this recirculation ballot]

Align all clauses to upper case

Cl 66 SC 66.5.3 P 60 L 12 # 52
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type E Comment Status D
[Submitted on behalf of Piers Dawe]
66.5.3 Put a space between [and] several times
SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response Response Status W
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
[The comment is against unchanged text, therefore is outside the scope of this recirculation ballot]
Global Change "[]" to "[]".

Cl 75 SC 75.10.4.13 P 97 L 43 # 58
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type E Comment Status D
[Submitted on behalf of Piers Dawe]
Don't need "measurements": the "shall" is in "The TDP limit shall be met." It's optional for OM2 Wavelength and spectral width; would save space to remove.

SuggestedRemedy
Delete "measurements" in OM8, consider same for OM2

Proposed Response Response Status W
PROPOSED ACCEPT.
[The comment is against unchanged text, therefore is outside the scope of this recirculation ballot]

Cl 75 SC 75.10.4.15 P 98 L 45 # 59
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type E Comment Status D
[Submitted on behalf of Piers Dawe]
Operating temperature range labeling is mandatory

SuggestedRemedy
Delete "N/A[]"

Proposed Response Response Status W
PROPOSED ACCEPT.
[The comment is against unchanged text, therefore is outside the scope of this recirculation ballot]

Cl 75 SC 75.4.1 P 74 L 34 # 13
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type E Comment Status D
In Table 75-5, Table 75--6, there is extra "and" between names of individual PMDs associated with the given columns; in Table 75--11 there is no such surrious "and" even though more than 1 PMD is associated with the particular columns; decide either way but make is consistent in Clause 75

SuggestedRemedy
Suggest to remove "and" from Table 75-5 and 75-6 (will not mark the whole table as changed)

Proposed Response Response Status W
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 75 SC 75.5.1 P 77 L 37 # 53
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type E Comment Status D
[Submitted on behalf of Piers Dawe]
Paragraph split over two pages

SuggestedRemedy
Set Table 75-9 to float

Proposed Response Response Status W
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
[The comment is against unchanged text, therefore is outside the scope of this recirculation ballot]
Tables will be set to float in all cases where it is necessary. Here, in plain text file, the table is in correct format i.e. does not split between two pages.

Cl 75 **SC 75.7.14** **P 86** **L 6** # **56**
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type T **Comment Status D**
[Submitted on behalf of Piers Dawe]
Why is there a section for receiver 3 dB electrical upper cutoff frequency when there is no spec or even recommendation for it?

SuggestedRemedy
Either add specs or recommendations, or delete 75.7.14, row of Table 75-13 and PICS OM12

Proposed Response **Response Status W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
[The comment is against unchanged text, therefore is outside the scope of this recirculation ballot]
3dB electrical upper cutoff frequency definition should be added.
Note that this parameter is also used e.g. in clause 52 or 59 without providing such a definition. A simple reference to measurement method is made.

Cl 75 **SC 75.7.9** **P 84** **L 42** # **55**
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type T **Comment Status D**
[Submitted on behalf of Piers Dawe]
Don't use * for multiply. More technically, "bitRate" is not defined, and the filter used for 10G is not 0.75 * signalling rate, but 7.5 GHz. Do you think you can hold the 10G filter to STM-16 (2.5Bd) tolerances? Clause 52 couldn't.

SuggestedRemedy
Change:
Bessel-Thomson receiver response with $fr = 0.75 * \text{bitRate}$, and where the relative response vs. relative frequency is defined in ITU-T G.957, Table B.2 (STM-16 values), along with the allowed tolerances for its physical implementation.
to
Bessel-Thomson receiver response as defined in 60.7.8 for 1 Gb/s PMD transmitters and 52.9.7 for 10 Gb/s PMD transmitters.

Proposed Response **Response Status W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.
[The comment is against unchanged text, therefore is outside the scope of this recirculation ballot]

Cl 75 **SC 75.9.3** **P 89** **L 35** # **57**
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type E **Comment Status D**
[Submitted on behalf of Piers Dawe]
Layout of table notes

SuggestedRemedy
Make Table 75-14 full width for the sake of the footnotes (and one column header).

Proposed Response **Response Status W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.
[The comment is against unchanged text, therefore is outside the scope of this recirculation ballot]
Will try to accomodate the commenter.

Cl 75C **SC 75C.1** **P 105** **L 32** # **60**
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type T **Comment Status D**
[Submitted on behalf of Piers Dawe]
Dj Rj Tj should be DJ RJ TJ. They may be 2-sided (early to late) but they aren't p-p. They are terrible metrics for 64B/66B anyway, it's a good thing this annex is informative!

SuggestedRemedy
Change "Dj (UI p--p) Rj (UI p--p) Tj (UI p--p)" to
DJ (UI) RJ (UI) TJ (UI)

Proposed Response **Response Status W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.
[The comment is against unchanged text, therefore is outside the scope of this recirculation ballot]
Confirm that a change in the units does not change the parameter values.

Cl 75C **SC 75C.1** **P 107** **L 10** # **61**
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type T **Comment Status D**
[Submitted on behalf of Piers Dawe]
downstream_baudrate should be downstream_signaling_rate line

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response **Response Status W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.
[The comment is against unchanged text, therefore is outside the scope of this recirculation ballot]

Cl 76 **SC 76.1.2** **P 108** **L 50** # **62**
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type **T** **Comment Status** **D**
[Submitted on behalf of Piers Dawe]
What mechanism?

SuggestedRemedy
Change to "this protocol"?

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
[The comment is against unchanged text, therefore is outside the scope of this recirculation ballot]
Change "mechanism" to "standard"

Cl 76 **SC 76.2.1** **P 109** **L 5** # **63**
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type **E** **Comment Status** **D**
[Submitted on behalf of Piers Dawe]
Should "data link layers to interface with a single physical layer" be:

SuggestedRemedy
"Data Link Layers to interface with a single Physical Layer" ? See 802.3 editor's style guide.

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**
PROPOSED REJECT.
[The comment is against unchanged text, therefore is outside the scope of this recirculation ballot]
An examination of the 2009 Style Guide shows no preference regarding Data Link Layers vs data link layers.

Cl 76 **SC 76.2.1** **P 109** **L 6** # **64**
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type **T** **Comment Status** **D**
[Submitted on behalf of Piers Dawe]
"data links which transmit" should be "data links that transmit". Anyway, the link doesn't unambiguously "transmit" and "receive" because it has two ends.

SuggestedRemedy
Should be something like "links with one data rate (e.g. 10 Gb/s) in one direction but another (e.g. 1 Gb/s) in the opposite direction"

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Change from:
"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)."
To:
"This subclause extends Clause 46 to enable multiple data link layers to interface with a single physical layer, and to enable data links that transmit at one data rate and receive at another data rate."

Cl 76 **SC 76.2.2.4** **P 113** **L 50** # **65**
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type **T** **Comment Status** **D**
[Submitted on behalf of Piers Dawe]
What does "binding" mean? Later on the same word is used in a different context "binding of an ONU to an OLT port". There's a mix of "mapping" and "binding" here and in 76.2.6; should use same word for same thing, each time.

SuggestedRemedy
Change "binding" to "mapping", three times

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
[The comment is against unchanged text, therefore is outside the scope of this recirculation ballot]
Change "binding" to "mapping" in 3 places (pg 113 ln 50, pg 115 ln 7 & 22).

Cl 76 **SC 76.3.1.1** **P 117** **L 52** # **67**
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type **T** **Comment Status** **D**
[Submitted on behalf of Piers Dawe]
"no explicit specification"?

SuggestedRemedy
"no further explicit specification"?

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

Cl 76 **SC 76.3.1.1** **P 118** **L 11** # **72**
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type **E** **Comment Status** **D**
[Submitted on behalf of Piers Dawe]
Something masking top of "PCS"; also in line 30

SuggestedRemedy
Per comment

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
[The comment is against unchanged text, therefore is outside the scope of this recirculation ballot]
Figure 76-5 looks correct. Editor will work on Figure 76-6.

Cl 76 **SC 76.3.1.1** **P 118** **L 3** # **68**
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type **E** **Comment Status** **D**
[Submitted on behalf of Piers Dawe]
RECONCILIATION should be Reconciliation, Transmit Function should be Transmit function, Receive Function should be Receive function, Conceptual Diagram of 10/1GBASE-PRX PCS, OLT Side should be Conceptual diagram of 10/1GBASE-PRX PCS, OLT side

SuggestedRemedy
Per comment

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
[The comment is against unchanged text, therefore is outside the scope of this recirculation ballot]
Make similar changes to Figure 76-6.

Cl 76 **SC 76.3.2** **P 118** **L 48** # **73**
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type **T** **Comment Status** **D**
[Submitted on behalf of Piers Dawe]
PCS transmit function should be PCS Transmit function; also in line 49

SuggestedRemedy
Per comment

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

Cl 76 **SC 76.3.2** **P 119** **L 11** # **69**
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type **T** **Comment Status** **D**
[Submitted on behalf of Piers Dawe] IDLE DELETION should be Idle Deletion, and so on

SuggestedRemedy
Per comment

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**
PROPOSED REJECT.
Capitalization is the same as found in Figure 49-4 of the current standard.

Cl 76 **SC 76.3.2.1** **P 119** **L 40** # **27**
Mandin, Jeffrey PMC-Sierra

Comment Type **T** **Comment Status** **D**
Draft 3.2 changed "Idle detection" to "Idle deletion", but did not do so in each place necessary.

SuggestedRemedy
Change "Idle Detection" to "Idle Deletion" on page 119, line 40.
Also on page 156, line 28.

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

CI 76 SC 76.3.2.4 P 124 L 7 # 74
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type T Comment Status D

[Submitted on behalf of Piers Dawe]

Document uses a mix of "FEC F/frame" and "FEC block". Need to pick one: KR uses "FEC block" almost exclusively. Make 9 changes.

SuggestedRemedy

Per comment

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change all instances of "FEC frame" and "FEC Frame" to "FEC block".

Full document search only finds 7 instances for FEC F/frame (pg 124 ln 8, pg 127 ln 35, pg 128 ln 4, pg 140 ln 34, pg 158 ln 6, 30 & 31).

CI 76 SC 76.3.2.4.1 P 124 L 27 # 75
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type T Comment Status D

[Submitted on behalf of Piers Dawe]

How does $x8+x4+x3+x2+1$ equal $0x02$? I thought we had established that $0x02$ just means 2, or 00000011 in binary. Needs better explanation (again!)

SuggestedRemedy

Per comment

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

The expressing given in the comment all equate to the same thing. Two (decimal) is still two (binary or hex) regardless of the base used to express it. We have simply used hex as clearly denoted by the "0x" which was obviously clear to the comment author.

CI 76 SC 76.3.2.5 P 128 L 16 # 76
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type T Comment Status D

[Submitted on behalf of Piers Dawe]

"one packet of a maximum length (forty 66-bit blocks)." 320 bytes? The maximum 802.3 MAC frame is 2000 bytes so the maximum packet is similar: about 250 66-bit blocks. This isn't right.

SuggestedRemedy

Explain / Correct the statement included in D3.2

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change last sentence from

"The length of the FIFO_DD buffer should be large enough to hold the amount of data equal to the maximum amount of parity data that may be inserted within the transmission time of one packet of a maximum length (forty 66-bit blocks)."

To:

"The length of the FIFO_DD buffer should be large enough to hold the maximum amount of parity data that may be inserted within the transmission time of one packet of a maximum length (at most forty 66-bit blocks of parity data)."

CI 76 SC 76.3.2.5.1 P 128 L 10 # 23
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

Removal of Figure 76-14 was justified at the time, though in the long run, we lose some solid piece of explanation on how Data Detector works in graphical terms. I think it is worth considering bringing the Figure back but with modifications, as proposed in 3av_0905_hajduczenia_3.pdf. Changes to the text in 76.3.2.5.1 are also marked in the file.

SuggestedRemedy

Per comment.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

Removal was approved by the task force.

Cl 76 **SC 76.3.2.5.1** **P 128** **L 20** # **22**
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.
Comment Type **T** **Comment Status** **D**
 Unknown PCS - 10GBASE-PRU
SuggestedRemedy
 Change to "10GBASE-PR-U"
Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 76 **SC 76.3.2.5.1** **P 128** **L 38** # **24**
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.
Comment Type **ER** **Comment Status** **D**
 In text "(Treceiver_settling) and synchronize its receive clock (TCDR)." - "receiver_settling" and "CDR" should be subscripted.
SuggestedRemedy
 Per comment.
Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 76 **SC 76.3.2.6** **P 134** **L 14** # **25**
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.
Comment Type **E** **Comment Status** **D**
 Logical condition between states FEC_IS_ON and TRANSMIT_PARITY in Figure 76-17 is broken without any reason. Put it into a single line.
SuggestedRemedy
 Per comment.
Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 [The comment is against unchanged text, therefore is outside the scope of this recirculation ballot]

Cl 76 **SC 76.3.3.1** **P 136** **L 18** # **77**
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.
Comment Type **T** **Comment Status** **D**
 [Submitted on behalf of Piers Dawe]
 31*66 blocks? See style guide and editor's web page for proper multiplication sign. Should this be "31, 66-bit blocks"? Same in 76.3.3.2.
SuggestedRemedy
 Per comment
Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
 [The comment is against unchanged text, therefore is outside the scope of this recirculation ballot]
 Change "31*66-bit blocks" to "thirty-one 66-bit blocks" in two places (pg 136 ln 18, pg 139 ln 51).
 This is consistent with other cases in the draft where we refer to a quantity of 66-bit blocks (for example see pg 121 ln 1, pg 128 ln 16 among others).

Cl 76 **SC 76.3.3.1** **P 136** **L 19** # **8**
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.
Comment Type **T** **Comment Status** **D**
 [Submitted on behalf of Duane Remein]
 Wordsmything Similar to comment 163 in D3.0)
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."
 to:
 "While in codeword lock, the synchronizer copies the FEC-protected bits from each data block and the parity bits of the codeword into an input buffer."
Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.
 [The comment is against unchanged text, therefore is outside the scope of this recirculation ballot]

Cl 76 *SC* 76.3.3.1.1 *P* 136 *L* 52 # 78

Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

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

[Submitted on behalf of Piers Dawe]
Justify or remove [] in inbuffer[] Also 76.3.3.3.1 outbuffer[]

SuggestedRemedy
Per comment

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
[The comment is against unchanged text, therefore is outside the scope of this recirculation ballot]
The draft contains 13 variables declared as arrays. 7 use no subscripts in the declaration, 2 use "<>" and 4 use "[]". IEEE Style guide and Editors info WEB Pages do not address the issue.
The editors suggest rationalizing all array variable definitions.
See 3av_0905_remein_2.pdf for details on this proposal.

Cl 76 *SC* 76.3.3.1.3 *P* 138 *L* 1 # 79

Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

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

[Submitted on behalf of Piers Dawe]
Justify or remove () in BlockFromPMA(). Note that () was almost never used before EFM. also on other pages.

SuggestedRemedy
Per comment

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.
Parenthesis were added in D3.2 and approved by the task force (see D3.0 comment #158). Another comment to remove parenthesis from function names was rejected (see D3.0 comment #72).

Cl 76 *SC* 76.3.3.2 *P* 140 *L* 1 # 80

Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

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

[Submitted on behalf of Piers Dawe]
Figure 76-19-PCS Receive bit ordering? Explain / clarify the caption

SuggestedRemedy
Per comment

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED REJECT.
The commenter has indicated his intention to withdraw this comment.

Cl 76 *SC* 76.3.3.3 *P* 143 *L* 8 # 81

Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **D** *True/FALSE*

[Submitted on behalf of Piers Dawe]
false or FALSE?

SuggestedRemedy
Choose one and use consistently in all clauses.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
[The comment is against unchanged text, therefore is outside the scope of this recirculation ballot]
[should be against Clause 00]
See resolution to comment #9.

Cl 76 SC 76.3.3.3 P 144 L 6 # 82
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type T Comment Status D

[Submitted on behalf of Piers Dawe]

Text says "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." There are 31, 66-bit blocks in a codeword, right? Per Fig 49-16, it takes 16 bad sync headers to trip out of block lock and start slipping again. Is this really what you want; a single uncorrectable FEC codeword pulls the link down (even if not for very long)?

SuggestedRemedy

Per comment

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

An option exists to allow each block to be passed unchanged. The downside of this is that the rate of false frame acceptance is increased (hence it is an option).

Cl 76 SC 76.3.3.3.1 P 144 L 28 # 70
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type E Comment Status D

[Submitted on behalf of Piers Dawe]
What TYPE?

SuggestedRemedy

Change to "TYPE: array"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

[The comment is against unchanged text, therefore is outside the scope of this recirculation ballot]

Cl 76 SC 76.3.3.3.3 P 145 L 12 # 7
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type T Comment Status D

[Submitted on behalf of Duane Remein]
BlockToDescrambler should be BlockToDescrambler()

SuggestedRemedy

replace BlockToDescrambler with BlockToDescrambler()

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

[The comment is against unchanged text, therefore is outside the scope of this recirculation ballot]

Cl 76 SC 76.3.3.3.4 P 145 L 46 # 105
Kimura, Mitsunobu Hitachi Communicatio

Comment Type G Comment Status D

"10/1GBASE-PRS-U" is shown.

pg 145 In 46

SuggestedRemedy

Change "10/1GBASE-PRS-U" to "10/1GBASE-PRX-U".

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 76 SC 76.3.3.3.4 P 145 L 46 # 83
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type T Comment Status D

[Submitted on behalf of Piers Dawe]

"10GBASE-PR, 10GBASE-PR-U and 10/1GBASE-PRS-U" Should PRS be PRX? Isn't 10GBASE-PR-U a subset of 10GBASE-PR so why mention it? Also 76.3.3.7

pg 145 In 46

SuggestedRemedy

Per comment

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 76 SC 76.3.3.3.4 P 145 L 47 # 26
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

"10/1GBASE-PRS-U" does not exist - "10/1GBASE-PRX-U" does

pg 145 In 46

SuggestedRemedy

Per comment

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 76 **SC 76.3.3.3.4** **P 145** **L 51** # **84**
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type T **Comment Status D**
[Submitted on behalf of Piers Dawe]
The FEC decoding process function. Delete "function"?

SuggestedRemedy
Per comment

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

Cl 76 **SC 76.3.3.4** **P 146** **L 35** # **85**
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type T **Comment Status D**
[Submitted on behalf of Piers Dawe]
The following objects apply to 10G-EPON PCS management. Should that be objectives? If you mean objects, there is no mention of "objects" except in Clause 30. Anyway, why is this paragraph under a heading "BER Monitor control"? If you want to talk about the link between Clause 76 and (optional) MDIO, that's usually done near the beginning of each sublayer's (sub)clause.

SuggestedRemedy
Per comment

Proposed Response **Response Status W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
[The comment is against unchanged text, therefore is outside the scope of this recirculation ballot]
Change the word "objects" to "paragraphs".

Cl 76 **SC 76.3.3.4.4** **P 171** **L 19** # **28**
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type T **Comment Status D**
[Submitted on behalf of Seiji Kozaki]
In Figure 76-22, the moving condition from BER_BAD_SH to BER_TEST_SH is wrong. To understand clearly, please see and compare with Figure 49-13.

SuggestedRemedy
Change "ber_test_sh * ber_cnt < ber_threshold * interval_timer_done" to "ber_test_sh * ber_cnt < ber_threshold * !interval_timer_done".

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

Cl 76 **SC 76.3.3.7** **P 149** **L 16** # **106**
Kimura, Mitsunobu Hitachi Communicatio

Comment Type G **Comment Status D**
"10/1GBASE-PRS-U" is shown.

SuggestedRemedy
Change "10/1GBASE-PRS-U" to "10/1GBASE-PRX-U".

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

Cl 76 **SC 76.3.3.7.3** **P 150** **L 20** # **6**
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type T **Comment Status D**
[Submitted on behalf of Duane Remein]
T_TYPE defined twice, once in 76.3.2.1.3 "T_TYPE(tx_raw<71:0>)
This function is defined in 49.2.13.2.3." and again in 76.3.3.7.3. "T_TYPE(rx_raw)
This function is defined in 49.2.13.2.3."

SuggestedRemedy
In remove definition in 76.3.3.7.3 and refer back to definition in 76.3.2.1.3.

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

Cl 76 **SC 76.99** **P 159** **L 4** # **11**
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type T **Comment Status D**
[Submitted on behalf of Duane Remein]
Subclause 76A.2, Table 76A-1 may be mis-interperated. Is it read in rows or in columns?

SuggestedRemedy
Add a footnote stating the table is to be read left to right, top to bottom.

Proposed Response **Response Status W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.
[The comment is against unchanged text, therefore is outside the scope of this recirculation ballot]

Cl 76A **SC 76A** **P 158** **L 6** # **86**
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type **E** **Comment Status** **D**
[Submitted on behalf of Piers Dawe]
76A FEC Frame Encoding example should be FEC block encoding example,

SuggestedRemedy
Per comment

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.
[The comment is against unchanged text, therefore is outside the scope of this recirculation ballot]
See resolution to comment #74.

Cl 76A **SC 76A.2** **P 158** **L 36** # **87**
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type **E** **Comment Status** **D**
[Submitted on behalf of Piers Dawe]
76A.2 64B/66B Block Input should be 64B/66B block input

SuggestedRemedy
Per comment

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.
[The comment is against unchanged text, therefore is outside the scope of this recirculation ballot]

Cl 76A **SC 76A.2** **P 159** **L 5** # **16**
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type **T** **Comment Status** **D**
Table 76A-1 could be more readable if it was presented in two columns only - see 3av_0905_hajduczenia_1.pdf

SuggestedRemedy
Per comment.

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**
PROPOSED REJECT.
[The comment is against unchanged text, therefore is outside the scope of this recirculation ballot]
Converting to two columns would break the table across multiple pages decreasing the readability. The tables in cl 76A are also provided in machine readable format so a reader can easily import and re-format to their hearts content.

Cl 76A **SC 76A.8** **P 163** **L 23** # **17**
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type **T** **Comment Status** **D**
Table 76A-7 could be more readable if it was presented in two columns only - see 3av_0905_hajduczenia_2.pdf

SuggestedRemedy
Per comment.

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**
PROPOSED REJECT.
[The comment is against unchanged text, therefore is outside the scope of this recirculation ballot]
The table is presented in the same format as Table 76A-1 for consistency. The tables in cl 76A are also provided in machine readable format so a reader can easily import and re-format to their hearts content.

Cl 77 **SC 77.1.3** **P 169** **L 41** # **88**
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type **E** **Comment Status** **D**
[Submitted on behalf of Piers Dawe]
Figure 77-4: White stuff over text? line 41

SuggestedRemedy
Remove the offending element

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

CI 77 SC 77.2.2.1 P 175 L 31 # 97
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type T Comment Status D

[Submitted on behalf of Duane Remein]
"FEC_CODEWORD_SIZE value appears to be in error."

SuggestedRemedy

Change from 148 to 223. Change line41 (FEC_PAYLOAD_SIZE) from 216 to 223.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.
[The comment is against unchanged text, therefore is outside the scope of this recirculation ballot]
The values are correct.
FEC_Dsize = 27 x (72 [2xXGMII transfer] - 8 [control bits for 2xXGMII transfer]) = 1728 b = 216 B
FEC_Psize = 4 x (72 [2xXGMII transfer] - 8 [control bits for 2xXGMII transfer]) = 32 B
All in all, FEC_CODEWORD_SIZE = 248 B (excluding 64b/66b encoding data), which is invisible at MACC level.

CI 77 SC 77.2.2.7 P 181 L 8 # 71
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type E Comment Status D Text size

[Submitted on behalf of Piers Dawe]
Unnecessarily small font: 8 is minimum unless you are desperate for space (not here)

SuggestedRemedy

Change most or all 7 point (or smaller) to 8 point

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
[The comment is against unchanged text, therefore is outside the scope of this recirculation ballot]
Will try to accommodate the commenter though change in the font size will be marked as text change.

CI 77 SC 77.2.2.7 P 184 L 1 # 101
Mandin, Jeffrey PMC-Sierra

Comment Type T Comment Status D

Draft 3.2 revises the ONU control multiplexer in a way which uses "magic numbers" and calculates overhead differently than is done in the OLT.
Instead, we should ensure that each new burst maintains the current column alignment. The resulting solution is:
- simpler (no magic numbers)
- consistent with the approach in the OLT control mux
- more efficient (maximum of 3 bytes overhead per burst rather than 3 bytes per-FEC block)

SuggestedRemedy

Revise as in 3av_0509_mandin_1.pdf

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 77 SC 77.3.2.1 P 186 L 5 # 107
Kimura, Mitsunobu Hitachi Communicatio

Comment Type G Comment Status D Text size

In Figure 77-13, font size of index of each state, e.g. ("INIT", "WAIT FOR TRANSMIT", "TRANSMIT READY", "PARSE OPCODE", etc.) is bigger than Figure 77-12 and Figure 77-14.

SuggestedRemedy

Match the font size of index of each state in Figure 77-13 to the ones in Figure 77-12 and 77-14.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.
[The comment is against unchanged text, therefore is outside the scope of this recirculation ballot]
Will try to accommodate the commenter though change in the font size will be marked as text change (Figure 77-12).

CI 77 SC 77.3.3.2 P 191 L 49 # 100
Kramer, Glen Teknovus, Inc.

Comment Type T Comment Status D

[Submitted on behalf of Eric Lynskey]

Text refers to sync pattern of 0x5555 and needs to be updated to reflect current sync pattern.

SuggestedRemedy

. . .ONU sends a synchronization pattern (see 76.3.2.5.2) followed by a burst delimiter . . .

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

[The comment is against unchanged text, therefore is outside the scope of this recirculation ballot]

".ONU sends synchronization pattern (SP, see 76.3.2.5.2) followed by burst delimiter pattern (BURST_DELIMITER, see 76.3.2.5.2)."

CI 77 SC 77.3.3.6 P 195 L 24 # 99
Kramer, Glen Teknovus, Inc.

Comment Type E Comment Status D

The section contains multiple state diagrams

SuggestedRemedy

Change section title to State Diagrams

Same for 77.3.4.6

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

[The comment is against unchanged text, therefore is outside the scope of this recirculation ballot]

CI 77 SC 77.3.5.5 P 208 L 35 # 89
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type T Comment Status D

[Submitted on behalf of Piers Dawe]

Is deactive a word? I don't think so. Maybe inactive? And what is "the status value"? This is the only section in 802.3av that uses either term, so suspect they are both wrong terms.

SuggestedRemedy

Per comment

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

[The comment is against unchanged text, therefore is outside the scope of this recirculation ballot]

"status value" > "status parameter value", where "status" put into italics. Suggest to change the "deactive" into "inactive" in all references, maintaining text formatting (6 references altogether, 5 in text and 1 in state diagram).

CI 77 SC 77.3.5.6 P 210 L 41 # 98
Kramer, Glen Teknovus, Inc.

Comment Type T Comment Status D

In Figure 77-29, in INCOMING GRANT state, in the condition (length[counter] > laserOnTime + syncTime + laserOffTime + tailGuard)) all variables and constants are expressed in TQ, except the tailGuard. The tailGuard is defined as 38 octets.

Also, using such condition in this clause doesn't make sense, because minimum grant should allow for at least one full FEC codeword.

SuggestedRemedy

Using the following condition instead of the specified:

(length[counter] >= laserOnTime + syncTime + laserOffTime + minGrantLength))

Where minGrantLength is defined as

minGrantLength

TYPE: 32 bit unsigned

This constant represents the minimum effective duration of ONU's transmission, which is equal to one FEC codeword (see FEC_CODEWORD_SIZE in 77.2.2.1) expressed in units of time_quanta.

VALUE: 13

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

[The comment is against unchanged text, therefore is outside the scope of this recirculation ballot]

Cl 77 **SC 77.3.6.1** **P 215** **L 10** # **90**
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type T **Comment Status D**

[Submitted on behalf of Piers Dawe]

Bad filed name "OLT is 1G upstream capable"; should this be "OLT 1G upstream capability"?

SuggestedRemedy

Per comment

Proposed Response **Response Status W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

[The comment is against unchanged text, therefore is outside the scope of this recirculation ballot]

Change "OLT is 1G upstream capable" to "OLT supports 1Gb/s reception"

Change "OLT is 10G upstream capable" to "OLT supports 10Gb/s reception"

Change "OLT does not support 1 Gb/s reception" to "No"

Change "OLT supports 1 Gb/s reception" to "No"

Change "OLT does not support 10 Gb/s reception" to "No"

Change "OLT supports 10 Gb/s reception" to "No"

Cl 77 **SC 77.3.6.3** **P 218** **L 22** # **66**
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type E **Comment Status D**

[Submitted on behalf of Piers Dawe]

8 bit should be 8-bit

SuggestedRemedy

Scrub the document.

Proposed Response **Response Status W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

[The comment is against unchanged text, therefore is outside the scope of this recirculation ballot]

Cl 77 **SC 77.3.6.3** **P 218** **L 45** # **92**
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type T **Comment Status D**

[Submitted on behalf of Piers Dawe]

"when constructing a complying MPCP protocol implementation." Should apply in use, not just in constructing. We don't want to discuss non-complying implementations. Delete.

SuggestedRemedy

Per comment

Proposed Response **Response Status W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

[The comment is against unchanged text, therefore is outside the scope of this recirculation ballot]

Delete all occurrences of this text if offending (5 occurrences in total)

Cl 77 **SC 77.3.6.3** **P 247** **L 27** # **91**
 Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type T **Comment Status D**

[Submitted on behalf of Piers Dawe]

d) Discovery Information. This is a 16-bit flag register. Table 77-6 presents the internal structure of the Discovery Information flag field. Table 77-6-REGISTER_REQ MPCPDU Discovery Information Fields should be d) Discovery Information. This is a 16-bit flag register. Table 77-6 presents the structure of the Discovery Information field. Table 77-6-REGISTER_REQ MPCPDU Discovery Information field

SuggestedRemedy

Per comment

Proposed Response **Response Status W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

[The comment is against unchanged text, therefore is outside the scope of this recirculation ballot]

is

d) Discovery Information. This is a 16-bit flag register. Table 77-6 presents the <delete>internal</delete> structure of the Discovery Information flag field. Table 77-6-REGISTER_REQ MPCPDU Discovery Information <change>Fields</change> should be

d) Discovery Information. This is a 16-bit flag register. Table 77-6 presents the structure of the Discovery Information field. Table 77-6-REGISTER_REQ MPCPDU Discovery Information field

Cl 77 **SC 77.3.6.4** **P 219** **L 49** # **93**
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type **E** **Comment Status** **D**
[Submitted on behalf of Piers Dawe]
Split Table 77-7 REGISTER MPCPDU Flags field

SuggestedRemedy
Fix it

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.
[The comment is against unchanged text, therefore is outside the scope of this recirculation ballot]
Will try to accomodate the commenter's request.

Cl 77 **SC 77.3.6.4** **P 220** **L 10** # **94**
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type **T** **Comment Status** **D**
[Submitted on behalf of Piers Dawe]
Strange term "higher-layer-entity" Use proper term, here and next page.

SuggestedRemedy
Per comment

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**
PROPOSED REJECT.
[The comment is against unchanged text, therefore is outside the scope of this recirculation ballot]
This "term" is also used in subcluse 64.3.6.4 with no previous complaints.

Cl 77 **SC 77.3.6.5** **P 221** **L 23** # **95**
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type **T** **Comment Status** **D**
[Submitted on behalf of Piers Dawe]
In the following: b) Flags. this is an 8-bit flag register that indicates special requirements for the registration. Echoed assigned port. This field holds a 16-bit unsigned value reflecting the LLID of the port assigned following registration, as presented in Table 77-8. Table 77-8-REGISTER_ACK MPCPDU Flags fields

SuggestedRemedy
this should be This. Space after registration. Should Echoed assigned port start a new bullet or be deleted as similar to bullet c? Text says Echoed assigned port. This field holds a 16-bit unsigned value reflecting the LLID of the port assigned following registration, as presented in Table 77-8. but Table 77-8-REGISTER_ACK MPCPDU Flags fields says values 0 to 255 (8 bits).

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
[The comment is against unchanged text, therefore is outside the scope of this recirculation ballot]
- "this" should be "This".
- Add a space after "registration".
- Delete text ".Echoed assigned port. This field holds a 16-bit unsigned value reflecting the LLID of the port assigned following registration" from bullet b

Cl 77 **SC 77.3.6.5** **P 250** **L 37** # **96**
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type **E** **Comment Status** **X**
[Submitted on behalf of Piers Dawe]
Table width. Wasted space: set Figure 77-36-REGISTER_ACK MPCPDU to float?

SuggestedRemedy
Per comment

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**
[s/b Pg 222]
[was Clause 222 Subclause 222, s/b Cl 77 SubCl 77.3.6.5, changed required to import into comment database tool]
[The comment is against unchanged text, therefore is outside the scope of this recirculation ballot]
Will try to accomodate the commenter's request.

Cl 77 **SC 77.4.1** **P 223** **L 11** # **10**
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type **E** **Comment Status** **D**
[Submitted on behalf of Duane Remein]
Table 77-9 still using 1/1 Gb/s, 10/1 Gbps and 10/10 Gbps foro ONT types.

SuggestedRemedy
Change to 1G-EPO, 1/10G-EPON and 10/10G-EPON.

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
[The comment is against unchanged text, therefore is outside the scope of this recirculation ballot]
Change 1/1 Gbit/s to 1G-EPON
Change 10/1 Gbit/s to 10/1G-EPON
Change 10/10 Gbit/s to 10/10G-EPON

Cl 99 **SC 99** **P 14** **L 23** # **37**
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type **E** **Comment Status** **D**
[Submitted on behalf of Piers Dawe]
Over-aggressive hyphenation

SuggestedRemedy
Set hyphenated minimum to 3: Paragraph designer, Advanced, set shortest suffix to 3

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**
PROPOSED REJECT.
1) Per the IEEE Style Manual (section 13.6) "In most cases, compound adjectives (such as fiber-optic cable, lead-acid batteries, power-operated valve assemblies) should be hyphenated. IEEE-SA project editors check documents for consistency of hyphenation; when the working group has a decided preference (such as life cycle process), that preference will be enforced. The use of hyphenated multiple adjectives (such as compressed-air-actuated power tools) should be limited to cases where such use is necessary to ensure comprehension." This implies the IEEE editors wil have their way with hyphens, even overly aggressive ones.
2) The TOC (text this comment is about) is not part of the standard and will be removed before publication.
3) Manual style changes (which is what would have to be done in this case unless we want to risk unintended changes throughout the draft) are inherently error prone and should be avoided.

Cl 99 **SC 99** **P 2** **L 2** # **30**
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type **E** **Comment Status** **D**
[Submitted on behalf of Piers Dawe]
Missing spaces

SuggestedRemedy
10Gb/s should be 10 Gb/s 4 times, 1Gb/s should be 1 Gb/s (twice)

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
[The comment is against unchanged text, therefore is outside the scope of this recirculation ballot]
Fix all occurrences:
5 instances of 10Gb/s (pg 2 ln 2 (three times), ln 3, pg 43 ln 27),
2 instances of 1Gb/s (pg 2 ln 18, 20).

Cl 99 **SC 99** **P 3** **L 13** # **31**
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type **E** **Comment Status** **D**
[Submitted on behalf of Piers Dawe]
IEEE Std 802.3xx-200X

SuggestedRemedy
Should this be IEEE Std 802.3av-200X ? Also at line 40. If so, TM at p4 line 21 would appear earlier, not there.

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
[The comment is against unchanged text, therefore is outside the scope of this recirculation ballot]
Change two instances of "IEEE Std 802.3xx-200X" to "IEEE Std 802.3-2008" (Pg 3 ln 13 & Ln 40). Change 1 instance of "P802.3xx to P802.3av" (Pg 6 ln 3).

Cl 99 **SC 99** **P 3** **L 37** # **32**
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type **E** **Comment Status** **D**
[Submitted on behalf of Piers Dawe]
IEEE Std 802.3-200X

SuggestedRemedy
Should be IEEE Std 802.3-2008 Also at line 43

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.
[The comment is against unchanged text, therefore is outside the scope of this recirculation ballot]

Cl 99 **SC 99** **P 3** **L 40** # **33**
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type **E** **Comment Status** **D**
[Submitted on behalf of Piers Dawe]

SuggestedRemedy
change "is comprises of" to "is composed of" or to "comprises"

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**
PROPOSED REJECT.
[The comment is against unchanged text, therefore is outside the scope of this recirculation ballot]
The phrase "is comprises of" does not exist in the draft.

Cl 99 **SC 99** **P 4** **L 10** # **34**
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type **E** **Comment Status** **D**
[Submitted on behalf of Piers Dawe]
As in P802.3bc, please change "specify subscriber access physical layers and sublayers" to...

SuggestedRemedy
specify subscriber access and other physical layers and sublayers

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**
PROPOSED REJECT.
[The comment is against unchanged text, therefore is outside the scope of this recirculation ballot]
This is required text provided by the working group (see "CURRENT 0109 V7 Generalized Front Matter for 802.3 Projects (FrameMaker)" (or V8, which is believed to be the same) at <http://www.ieee802.org/3/tools/index.html>) and will not appear in the published standard.

Cl 99 **SC 99** **P 5** **L 39** # **35**
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type **E** **Comment Status** **D**
[Submitted on behalf of Piers Dawe]
Why is this URL not blue like the others? Also bottom of p33, p158

SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.
[The comment is against unchanged text, therefore is outside the scope of this recirculation ballot]

Cl 99 **SC 99** **P 6** **L 18** # **36**
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type **E** **Comment Status** **D**
[Submitted on behalf of Piers Dawe]
Ordinary members should appear here.

SuggestedRemedy
Using graphics tools, select graphical object (arrow symbol), stretch the bottom of the triple columns and the bottom of the anchored frame so it fits on p6. You will have to move a few names to the continuation frame (and maybe resize it also).

Proposed Response **Response Status** **W**
PROPOSED REJECT.
[The comment is against unchanged text, therefore is outside the scope of this recirculation ballot]
This is part of the required template provided by the working group (see "CURRENT 0109 V7 Generalized Front Matter for 802.3 Projects (FrameMaker)" (or V8, which is believed to be the same) at <http://www.ieee802.org/3/tools/index.html>) and will not appear in the published standard.