*Cl* **00** *SC* **0** *P* **0** *L* **0** # 1

Turner, Michelle

*Comment Type* **ER** *Comment Status* **A**

This draft has met all editorial requirements.

*SuggestedRemedy*

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

ACCEPT.
Are you sure ? Please check again :))))

*Cl* **00** *SC* **0** *P* **122** *L* **10** # 4

Kramer, Glen Teknovus, Inc.

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

[Marked subclause 0 since it applies to clauses C76 and C77]
Draft uses 7 instances of "byte", while the convention is to use "octets"

*SuggestedRemedy*

replace "byte" with "octet"
replace "bytes" with "octets"
page 122, line 3 - 1 instance
page 122, line 10 - 2 instances
page 122, line 11 - 2 instances
page 122, line 12 - 1 instance
page 146, line 3 - 1 instance
page 174, line 53 - 1 instance
page 215, line 41 - 1 instance
page 215, line 43 - 1 instance

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

ACCEPT.
Replace in all other locations if any are found.

*Cl* **00** *SC* **0** *P* **155** *L* **30** # 5

Kramer, Glen Teknovus, Inc.

*Comment Type* **E** *Comment Status* **A** *N-bit*

[Marked subclause 0 since it applies to multiple clauses]
still many instances where n-bit misses the hyphen

*SuggestedRemedy*

insert hyphens
page 155, line 30 ---64 bit payload
page 160, line 14 ---64 bit payload
page 162, line 38 --- 32 bit timestamp
page 173, line 26 --- 32 bit unsigned
page 173, line 42 --- 32 bit unsigned
page 174, line 13 --- 16 bit unsigned
page 174, line 30 --- 32 bit unsigned
page 174, line 36 --- 16 bit unsigned
page 174, line 43 --- 16 bit unsigned
page 174, line 47 --- 16 bit unsigned
page 175, line 2 --- 16 bit unsigned
page 175, line 7 --- 32 bit unsigned
page 175, line 12 --- 32 bit unsigned
page 175, line 21 --- 8 bit unsigned
page 174, line 51 --- 16 bit unsigned
page 183, line 49 --- 16 bit wide
page 187, line 25 --- 8 bit unsigned
page 187, line 33 --- 8 bit unsigned
page 187, line 53 --- 32 bit unsigned
page 188, line 11 --- 8 bit unsigned
page 188, line 17 --- 8 bit unsigned
page 188, line 32 --- 16 bit unsigned
page 188, line 41 --- 16 bit unsigned
page 197, line 37 --- 32 bit unsigned
page 201, line 47 --- 32 bit unsigned
page 201, line 53 --- 32 bit unsigned
page 202, line 5 --- 32 bit unsigned
page 202, line 36 --- 48 bit unsigned
page 202, line 37 --- 32 bit unsigned
page 202, line 38 --- 16 bit unsigned
page 202, line 53 --- 32 bit unsigned
page 203, line 18 --- 16 bit unsigned
page 203, line 34 --- 32 bit unsigned

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

ACCEPT.

*Cl* **45** *SC* **45.2.3.32** *P* **44** *L* **18** # 43

Kramer, Glen Teknovus, Inc.

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

[Submitted on behalf of Eric Lynskey]
The text swaps the positions of FEC and uncorrected, and is inconsistent with the title of the subclause.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change to: uncorrected FEC codewords counter.

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

ACCEPT.
Text is in line 19.

*Cl* **45** *SC* **45.2.3.33** *P* **44** *L* **47** # 50

Hajduczenia, Marek

*Comment Type* **T** *Comment Status* **A**

*** Comment submitted with the file 33716200024-3av_0906_hajduczenia_3.pdf attached ***

[submitted on behalf of Hu XinYu, with revisions from Marek Hajduczenia] "10G-EPON BER monitor threshold" occupies bits 8:15 (8 bits) and can have maximum value of 255. Yet, the description of this register states that value of 1600 is supposed to be written into it. Since it is not possible, either (i) limit the size of BER monitor timer and assign extra bits to BER monitor (discouraged, since limits the BER monitor timer value) or (ii) put the BER monitor into separate register at the end of reserved range.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Suggest to use option (ii) with changes listed in 3av_0906_hajduczenia_3.pdf and marked in blue.

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

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Use 3av_0906_hajduczenia_4.pdf.
Editors have explicit editorial license to make additional changes as required in relation with the issue at hand.

*Cl* **75** *SC* **75.1.4** *P* **61** *L* **11** # 10

Hamano, Hiroshi Fujitsu Component LT

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

In recent drafts, the words '10/10G-EPON' and '10/1G-EPON' are mainly used instead of 'symmetric-rate' and 'asymmetric-rate'. They are already defined in Subclause 1.4, and no consistency problem exists. But the wording clarification once again in Clause 75 seems much friendlier to the readers.
'10/10G-EPON' and '10/1G-EPON' appear first only slightly in Subclause 75.1.5. But they should be more clearly described in earlier introductory stage of the draft.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Insert '10/10G-EPON' and '10/1G-EPON' words in the texts as follows;
* PRX-type power budget describes asymmetric-rate PHY for PON operating at 10 Gb/s downstream and 1 Gb/s upstream over a single SMF, i.e. 10/1G-EPON (see objective b.1 above).
* PR-type power budget describes symmetric-rate PHY for PON operating at 10 Gb/s downstream and 10 Gb/s upstream over a single SMF, i.e. 10/10G-EPON (see objective b.2 above).

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

REJECT.
[comment type should be T]
P802.3av when published will make part of 802.3 and as such clause 75 builds on previous clauses through references, includinf definitions, symbols etc. Once a term is included in clause 1.4, there is no need to redefine it again.

*Cl* **75** *SC* **75.4** *P* **70** *L* **16** # 11

Hamano, Hiroshi Fujitsu Component LT

*Comment Type* **E** *Comment Status* **A** *a single-mode solution*

The example description '(e.g., a single-mode solution operating at 10.5 km meets the minimum range requirement of 0.5 m to 10 km for PR10)' is strange, unclear, and misleading.
- There exists no minimum range requirement of 0.5 m to 10 km for PR10 in Table 75-1. It was already replaced by maximum reach requirement of >=10 km.
- 10G-EPON has no multi-mode solutions along with a single-mode one, unlike 1000BASE-LX (Subclause 38.4).

*SuggestedRemedy*

Delete '(e.g., a single-mode solution operating at 10.5 km meets the minimum range requirement of 0.5 m to 10 km for PR10)'.
It seems that the text just before the description is not necessary, either.

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

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
[comment type should be T]
Delete: "(e.g., a single-mode solution operating at 10.5 km meets the minimum range requirement of 0.5 m to 10 km for PR10)"
Change on page 70, line 16
Change on page 73, line 41

*Cl* **75** *SC* **75.5** *P* **73** *L* **41** # 12

Hamano, Hiroshi Fujitsu Component LT

*Comment Type* **E** *Comment Status* **A** *a single-mode solution*

The example description '(e.g., a single-mode solution operating at 10.5 km meets the minimum range requirement of 0.5 m to 10 km for PR10)' is strange, unclear, and misleading.
- There exists no minimum range requirement of 0.5 m to 10 km for PR10 in Table 75-1. It was already replaced by maximum reach requirement of >=10 km.
- 10G-EPON has no multi-mode solutions along with a single-mode one, unlike 1000BASE-LX (Subclause 38.4).

*SuggestedRemedy*

Delete '(e.g., a single-mode solution operating at 10.5 km meets the minimum range requirement of 0.5 m to 10 km for PR10)'.
It seems that the text just before the description is not necessary, either.

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

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
[comment type should be T]
See comment #11.

*Cl* **75** *SC* **75.5.1** *P* **74** *L* **17** # 13

Hamano, Hiroshi Fujitsu Component LT

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

Footnote for Launch OMA (min) is mistaken.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change footnote 'c' to 'b'.

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

ACCEPT.
[comment type should be T]
Editor: reference to OMA is not live

*Cl* **75** *SC* **75.7.10** *P* **82** *L* **28** # 14

Hamano, Hiroshi Fujitsu Component LT

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

TDP indicates transmitter AND dispersion penalty, which includes also transmitter impairments NOT caused by chromatic dispersion effects.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change the text
'TDP measurement tests transmitter impairments caused by chromatic dispersion effectsc'
to
'TDP measurement tests transmitter impairments and its chromatic dispersion effectsc'

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

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
[comment type should be T]
'TDP measurement tests transmitter impairments caused by chromatic dispersion effects' to 'TDP measurement tests transmitter impairments, including chromatic dispersion effects, '

*Cl* **75B** *SC* **75B.2** *P* **99** *L* **24** # 20

Feng, Dongning Huawei

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

Speficied?

*SuggestedRemedy*

Specified

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

ACCEPT.

*Cl* **75C** *SC* **75C.1** *P* **102** *L* **23** # 44

Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

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

Thank you for correcting Dj to DJ and so on. There is still the issue of "p-p". My point is that there is a parameter called "peak-to-peak jitter" which is a menu pick on an oscilloscope. It is none of these. In a typical measurement, DJ would be less than "peak-to-peak jitter", TJ would be greater than it, and RJ could be either. These jitter metrics DJ, RJ and TJ might be two-sided (late time - early time, not late time - average time) but they don't involve the measured peaks.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Delete "p-p", six times. If you want a reference for jitter metrics, it's MJSQ - I can provide the details if you are interested.

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

REJECT.
[this comment was submitted on behalf of Piers Dawe]
DJ is estimated in Uip-p. RJ is Gausian and has no peak-jitter nature, but in the jitter budget tables, the numbers are DJ aligned value derived from RMS to calculate TJ, as indicated in 3av_0809_kozaki_2.pdf. DJ, RJ, and TJ should be all defined in Uip-p.

*Cl* **76** *SC* **76.2.1** *P* **105** *L* **37** # 45

Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

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

Per ISO/IEC 7 layer standard, I believe "data link layers" should be "Data Link Layers". Although I'm not sure it can be plural, strictly; could change to "MACs". Per 802.3 editors' advice, Physical Layer has capitals.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change "data link layers to interface with a single physical layer" to "MACs to interface with a single Physical Layer"

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

ACCEPT.
[this comment was submitted on behalf of Piers Dawe]

*Cl* **76** *SC* **76.3.2.1.5** *P* **118** *L* **17** # 51

Hajduczenia, Marek

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

In Figure 76-9, state name says "DELTE_IDLE" while it should say "DELETE_IDLE". Please fix it

*SuggestedRemedy*

per comment

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

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Make changes in Figure 76-9 and Figure 76-10.

*Cl* **76** *SC* **76.3.2.4.3** *P* **124** *L* **5** # 21

Feng, Dongning Huawei

*Comment Type* **E** *Comment Status* **A** *N-bit*

2 bit?

*SuggestedRemedy*

2-bit or 2 bits

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

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
See comment #5

*Cl* **76** *SC* **76.3.3.1** *P* **132** *L* **13** # 7

Kramer, Glen Teknovus, Inc.

*Comment Type* **T** *Comment Status* **A**

The OLT codeword synchronization function receives data via the 16-bit PMA_UNITDATA.request primitive is incorrect. PMA_UNITDATA.request should be PMA_UNITDATA.indication Compare to similar text for ONU synchronization.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Replace PMA_UNITDATA.request with PMA_UNITDATA.indication.

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

ACCEPT.

*Cl* **76** *SC* **76.3.3.2.5** *P* **140** *L* **52** # 8
Kramer, Glen Teknovus, Inc.

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

The OLT synchronizer state diagram has title "Figure 76--18--OLT Synchronizer state diagram", but the ONU synchronizer state diagram has title "Figure 76--20--Codeword lock state diagram". It would be nicer to give these two figures similar titles.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change "Figure 76--20--Codeword lock state diagram" to "Figure 76--20--ONU Synchronizer state diagram"

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

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
This is not a critical change.
Instruction to Editor: introduce these changes only if that mark entire state diagram as a changed text.

*Cl* **76** *SC* **76.3.3.3.2** *P* **141** *L* **44** # 42
Kramer, Glen Teknovus, Inc.

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

[Submitted on behalf of Eric Lynskey]
The two FEC counters defined here are mapped back to 45.2.3.31. If you go to Clause 45, it gives the counters a slightly different name. Instead of FEC_corrected_blocks_counter, it uses corrected_FEC_codewords_counter. It's a fairly minor issue, but it would be nice to use consistent names.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Rename counters in Clause 76 to match those in Clause 45.

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

ACCEPT.

*Cl* **76A** *SC* **76A.1** *P* **155** *L* **18** # 22
Feng, Dongning Huawei

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

locatio

*SuggestedRemedy*

location

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

ACCEPT.

*Cl* **76A** *SC* **76A.2** *P* **155** *L* **37** # 2
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

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

To improve readability, please make sure that Table 76A-1 is not divided between pages.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Per comment

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

ACCEPT.

*Cl* **76A** *SC* **76A.2** *P* **156** *L* **30** # 23
Feng, Dongning Huawei

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

hexidecimal? wrong spell

*SuggestedRemedy*

hexadecimal

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

ACCEPT.

*Cl* **76A** *SC* **76A.5** *P* **159** *L* **27** # 24
Feng, Dongning Huawei

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

hexidecimal? wrong spell

*SuggestedRemedy*

hexadecimal

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

ACCEPT.

*Cl* **76A** *SC* **76A.6** *P* **159** *L* **46** # 25
Feng, Dongning Huawei

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

hexidecimal? wrong spell

*SuggestedRemedy*

hexadecimal

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

ACCEPT.

*Cl* **76A** *SC* **76A.7** *P* **159** *L* **53** # 3

Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

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

To improve readability, please make sure that Table 76A-6 is not divided between pages.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Per comment

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

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
As per comment.
On Pg 160 line 40 change "Table 76G-1" to "Table 76A-8"

*Cl* **77** *SC* **77.1** *P* **161** *L* **11** # 30

Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

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

[submitted on behalf of Runjian Lin]
in the signal's paths from source to destination.

*SuggestedRemedy*

in the signal's paths from source to destinations.

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

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Suggest to change to "path from source to destination" - at any time the signal has only one path i.e. from OLT to ONU or vice versa.

*Cl* **77** *SC* **77.1.2** *P* **163** *L* **22** # 31

Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

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

[submitted on behalf of Runjian Lin]
MACs are uniquely identified by their LLID which is dynamically assigned by the registration process.

*SuggestedRemedy*

MACs are uniquely identified by their LLIDs dynamically assigned by the registration process.

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

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Change "MACs are uniquely identified by their LLIDs, which are dynamically assigned by the registration process."

*Cl* **77** *SC* **77.2.2.3** *P* **173** *L* **41** # 48

Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

*Comment Type* **T** *Comment Status* **A**

Variable fecOffset is described as "A clock that advances by 1 after every 8 bit times.". It is not a clock but a variable that advances on clock transitions.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Change "A clock that advances by 1 after every 8 bit times." to "A variable that advances by 1 every 8 bit times."

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

ACCEPT.

*Cl* **77** *SC* **77.2.2.3** *P* **173** *L* **45** # 49

Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

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

To simplify the reading process, cross-reference to Figure 77-14 would be nice in the definition of fecOffset variable.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Add "(see Figure 77-14)" at the end of line 46, make link live.

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

ACCEPT.

*Cl* **77** *SC* **77.2.2.3** *P* **175** *L* **32** # 26

Feng, Dongning Huawei

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

arrray?

*SuggestedRemedy*

array

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

ACCEPT.

*Cl* **77** *SC* **77.2.2.3** *P* **175** *L* **42** # 32

Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

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

[submitted on behalf of Runjian Lin]
in the process of transmitting a Frame.

*SuggestedRemedy*

in the process of transmitting a frame.

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

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Change "in a process of transmitting a Frame" to "in the process of transmitting a frame"

---

*Cl* **77** *SC* **77.2.2.4** *P* **176** *L* **40** # 27

Feng, Dongning Huawei

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

arrray?

*SuggestedRemedy*

array

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

ACCEPT.

---

*Cl* **77** *SC* **77.2.2.7** *P* **181** *L* **13** # 9

Kramer, Glen Teknovus, Inc.

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

In the past, the TF has decided to remove Start of Packet alignment function from the PCS sublayer. The arguments were that implementers may or may not implement this function without affecting interoperability. If not implemented, the additional overhead is insignificant. However, with the new ONU Control Multiplexer state diagram in D3.3, it appears there is a very small modification that will guarantee alignment of S character of the first frame in a burst to lane 0 of the first column.

*SuggestedRemedy*

In Figure 77-14 in transition from FRAME READY to START OF GRANT, change "1" to "2"
old condition: grantStart * fecOffset[1:0] = 0
new condition: grantStart * fecOffset[2:0] = 0

*Proposed Response* *Response Status* **Z**

REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

---

*Cl* **77** *SC* **77.2.2.7** *P* **181** *L* **13** # 47

Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

*Comment Type* **T** *Comment Status* **A**

Use of fecOffset[1:0] should be clarified. In other locations, [:] operator is used to bit arrays. In this case it is used on 32 bit unsigned value. Either change this reference into something more representative or explain which bits are taken for comparison and in what order. Definition of fecOffset could be probably a good location for that.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Per comment

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

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Suggest to add after definition of fecOffset:
"NOTE: Notation fecOffset[1:0] refers to two least significant bits of this variable."
Make link live. Use proper style for NOTE.

---

*Cl* **77** *SC* **77.3.3** *P* **184** *L* **18** # 33

Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

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

[submitted on behalf of Runjian Lin]
allocating and assigning new port identifiers (LLIDs) and bonding corresponding MACs to the LLIDs.

*SuggestedRemedy*

allocating and assigning a new port identifier (LLID) and bonding a corresponding MAC to the LLID.

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

ACCEPT.

*Cl* **77** *SC* **77.3.5.3** *P* **204** *L* **12** # 41

Kramer, Glen Teknovus, Inc.

*Comment Type* **T** *Comment Status* **A**

[Submitted on behalf of Eric Lynskey]
Table 77-1 shows the operation of the confirmDiscovery function. All but one possibility is covered regarding the OLT discovery window. It is not clear what value the function should return if it receives a discovery frame that does not open any discovery window. Although such a frame should not be transmitted, the function should have the ability to handle that set of inputs.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Add a new row at the bottom of the table: 0, 0, X, X, FALSE. Add a note under the table stating that this set of inputs should not normally be received by the ONU.

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

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Modification of Table 77-1 and suggested text of the footnote per 3av_0906_hajduczenia_2.pdf with changes:
- remove column 'Notes'
- put footnote a) reference to False in column 'confirmDiscovery(data) returns'
Change the text of footnote: "These particular values for the Discovery Window fields should not be normally generated by the OLT."

---

*Cl* **77** *SC* **77.3.5.3** *P* **204** *L* **25** # 29

Feng, Dongning Huawei

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

queueing?

*SuggestedRemedy*

queuing

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

ACCEPT.

---

*Cl* **77** *SC* **77.3.5.3** *P* **204** *L* **8** # 28

Feng, Dongning Huawei

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

functon?

*SuggestedRemedy*

function

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

ACCEPT.

---

*Cl* **77** *SC* **77.3.5.6** *P* **208** *L* **1** # 46

Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

*Comment Type* **T** *Comment Status* **A**

[submitted on behalf of Yang Cheng, with revisions from Marek Hajduczenia]
Transition between CHECK GATE TYPE and WAIT FOR START TIME on ELSE may lead to unexpected behaviour. If grantList contains a single grant, it is removed in WAIT FOR START TIME state and grantList becomes empty. If the retrieved grant is malformed in any way (neither of exit conditions from CHECK GATE TYPE state is met), ELSE exit condition will actuate, transferring state diagram back to WAIT FOR START TIME, where next grant will be again extracted but the grantList is still empty. It is much safer to make the transition from CHECK GATE TYPE on ELSE condition to WAIT FOR GRANT state.

*SuggestedRemedy*

Per comment

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

ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
In Figure 77-30, make the transition from CHECK GATE TYPE on ELSE condition to WAIT FOR GRANT state.
In Figure 77-30, change 'removeHead' to 'RemoveHead'.

---

*Cl* **77** *SC* **77.3.6.3** *P* **215** *L* **37** # 6

Kramer, Glen Teknovus, Inc.

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

unneeded space between "10" and "G" in "10 G registration attempt"

*SuggestedRemedy*

remove the space

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

ACCEPT.

*Cl* **77** *SC* **77.4.1** *P* **218** *L* **51** # 34

Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

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

[submitted on behalf of Runjian Lin]
This field allows the OLT to relay speed-specific information regarding the discovery window to the different ONUs

*SuggestedRemedy*

This field allows the OLT to relay speed-specific information regarding the discovery windows to the different ONUs

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

REJECT.
[The comment is against unchanged text, therefore is outside the scope of this recirculation ballot]
The previous line says "An additional field (Discovery Information field) was added to the 10 Gb/s discovery GATE MPCPDU." the text is therefore correct.

*Cl* **77** *SC* **77.4.2** *P* **219** *L* **52** # 35

Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

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

[submitted on behalf of Runjian Lin]
and if a 1Gb/s discovery window is opened, the ONU may attempt to register in the EPON.

*SuggestedRemedy*

and if a 1Gb/s discovery window is opened, the ONU may attempt to register in the 10/1G EPON.

*Proposed Response* *Response Status* **Z**

REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.

*Cl* **77** *SC* **77.4.2** *P* **220** *L* **44** # 36

Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

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

[submitted on behalf of Runjian Lin]
and if a 10Gb/s discovery window is opened, the ONU may attempt to register in the EPON.

*SuggestedRemedy*

and if a 10Gb/s discovery window is opened, the ONU may attempt to register in the 10G-EPON.

*Proposed Response* *Response Status* **Z**

REJECT.

This comment was WITHDRAWN by the commenter.