<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Proposed Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2217</td>
<td>Remine, Duane Huawei Technologies,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment Type: E, Comment Status: D, active subcarriers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agree on terms: non-excluded subcarriers (102.4.3.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Suggested Remedy: Change all instances (3) of &quot;non-excluded subcarriers&quot; to &quot;active subcarriers&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed Response: PROPOSED ACCEPT. See related comment 2215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2260</td>
<td>Remine, Duane Huawei Technologies,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment Type: E, Comment Status: D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Equation numbering style in not per 802.3 template. Should be (CCC-N) where CCC is the clause number and N is a running number in that clause.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Suggested Remedy: Align equation numbering in all clauses to latest 802.3 template style.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed Response: PROPOSED ACCEPT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2248</td>
<td>Remine, Duane Huawei Technologies,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment Type: T, Comment Status: D, NCP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Use of the term NCP is inconcnsistent and contradictory. Sometimes it appears as Ncp (subscripted as on pg 80 line 6) and refers to cyclic prefix length. Sometime (see pg line ) it appears as NCP (no subscripting) and refers to cyclic prefix length. Lastly it sometimes appears as NCP (subscripted) and refers to Next Codeword Pointer. This is confusing and misleading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Suggested Remedy: When used to refer to cyclic prefix length use NCP with CP subscripted. When used to refer to Next Codeword Pointer with &quot;FEC Codeword Pointer&quot;. (see related comments and remain_3bn_01_0814.pdf)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed Response: PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Correct file is remain_3bn_01b_0814.pdf (cmt 2258, Topic = exclusion rules) (see related comment 2258, Topic = NCP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>100.1.4</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2257</td>
<td>Powell, Bill Alcatel-Lucent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment Type: T, Comment Status: D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.4.2.280A OFDM channel (definition TBD) - Proposed definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Suggested Remedy: Suggest definition derived from vl01 D3.1 PHY spec: OFDM channel: A data transmission channel in which a large number of closely-spaced or overlapping very-narrow bandwidth orthogonal QAM signals are transmitted. Each of the QAM signals called subcarriers, carries a small percentage of the total payload at a very low data rate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed Response: PROPOSED ACCEPT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>100.1.4</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>2244</td>
<td>Remine, Duane Huawei Technologies,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment Type: E, Comment Status: D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>There is a conflict in the use of the term &quot;NCP&quot;; in some cases it refers to cyclic prefix length and at other times it refers to Next Codeword Pointer. Search the draft for the term &quot;NCP&quot;; when it refers to next codeword pointer, replace it with &quot;FEC Codeword Pointer&quot;. In figures the abbreviation &quot;FCP&quot; may be used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Suggested Remedy: In Figure 100-2 &amp; 100-3 Replace &quot;NCP ...&quot; with &quot;FCP ...&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed Response: PROPOSED ACCEPT.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IEEE 802.3bn EPON Protocol over Coax (EPoC) TF 1st Task Force review comments

Proposed Responses

Cl 100 SC 100.2.8.1.1 P 74 L 30 # 2262
Remen, Duane Huawei Technologies,

Comment Type E Comment Status D
Typo: "MHz channel"

Suggested Remedy
Fix with space "MHz channel" here

Proposed Response Response Status W
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 100 SC 100.2.8.1.1 P 74 L 33 # 2261
Remen, Duane Huawei Technologies,

Comment Type E Comment Status D
"CLT calculates power for data subcarrier and pilots (using total number of non-zero valued (nonexcluded) subcarriers)"
Everywhere else in the draft we refer to these as active subcarriers

Suggested Remedy
Change to read:
"CLT calculates power for data subcarrier and pilots (using total number of active subcarriers)"

Proposed Response Response Status W
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 100 SC 100.2.8.1.1 P 75 L 14 # 2256
Remen, Duane Huawei Technologies,

Comment Type T Comment Status D
Undefined terms
Active Signal Bandwidth (1 instance Pg 75 In 14) Table 100-1
RF output port muting (1 instance Pg 79 line 12) Table 100-2

Suggested Remedy
In Table 100-1 Change:
"Minimum Active Signal Bandwidth" to
"Minimum encompassed spectrum"

Proposed Response Response Status W
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Probably ok, but observation is that DOCSIS 3.1 is using the same "active signal" term in Table 7-39.
IEEE 802.3bn EPON Protocol over Coax (EPOC) TF 1st Task Force review comments

Proposed Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl 100</th>
<th>SC 100.2.8.2</th>
<th>P 77</th>
<th>L 35</th>
<th># 2263</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Remine, Duane</td>
<td>Huawei Technologies,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment Type: T  Comment Status: D

The term channel here is ambiguous

"100.2.8.2 Power per channel for CLT"

Suggested Remedy

Change to:

"100.2.8.2 Power per OFDM channel for CLT"

On line 39 change

"adjusting channel RF power" to

"adjusting OFDM channel RF power"

In Table 100-2 change

"per channel" to

"per OFDM channel" in it's first appearance in each row (6x)

In Table 100-2 change

"adjacent channels" to

"adjacent OFDM channels" (pg 78 LIn 15 & 19)

Proposed Response: Response Status: W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl 100</th>
<th>SC 11.1</th>
<th>P 84</th>
<th>L 27</th>
<th># 2291</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leo, Montreuil</td>
<td>Broadcom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment Type: TR  Comment Status: D

"Mode 1: . 50 dB carrier suppression within the occupied bandwidth in any one active channel. CLT shall accomplish this without service impacting discontinuity or detriment to the unsuppressed channels."

It is not at all clear to me how loss of one OFDM channel can not be service impacting.

Suggested Remedy

Add definitions of terms used in equation.

Proposed Response: Response Status: W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Note that D3.1 PHY Table 7-40 has the same problem of using these without definition. Need to find definitions or change term.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl 100</th>
<th>SC 2.8.1</th>
<th>P 73</th>
<th>L 51</th>
<th># 2212</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leo, Montreuil</td>
<td>Broadcom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment Type: ER  Comment Status: D

In the following text "... subcarrier spacing of and 150", it seem there are something missing after OF.

Suggested Remedy

Add missing text.

Proposed Response: Response Status: W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

The missing text is "50 kHz". (Reference D3.1 PHY Section 7.5.9)
I think the encompassed spectrum of 189.7 MHz is wrong. It was agreed before that we can have up to 3800 active subcarriers. This is 190 MHz of subcarrier or 190+0.05 = 190.05 MHz of RF bandwidth for a 192 MHz channel.

For the 24 MHz, it is 22 MHz of active subcarriers

Suggested Remedy

Use active subcarriers definition, 190 MHz of active subcarriers for 192 MHz.

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

We should clarify signal BW and avoid using "Active" in this table as it can be confused with Active Subcarriers.

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See related comment #2256 for proposed remedy.

Do we null carriers or mute them? Certainly we shouldn't refer to the same action with two different terms. We should use either null / nulling / nulled to mute / muted / muting Distribution in draft null 4
nulling 3
muted 0
muting 2

Suggested Remedy

Use null / nulling / nulled (these terms are the most prevalent in the current draft). If we decide to use mute then change this comment to Cl 00.

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Ref to Table 101-4 is misdirective. Should be to Table 76-4

"A number of LLIDs have been reserved (see Table 101–4) for various purposes, including downstream broadcast, discovery messages, and upstream registration request messages."

Suggested Remedy

Change ref and link to 76-4

PROPOSED ACCEPT.
Comment Type: E  Comment Status: D  Table 101-4/5

There is no reason not to combine Tables 101-4 & 101-5

Suggested Remedy
Combine tables by adding a column for US/DS. Update all cross references.

Proposed Response: PROPOSED ACCEPT.
See related comment 2278 (impacts Table 101-4/5, Topic = 65B blocking)

Comment Type: T  Comment Status: D  LDPC code sel

There is no proposed register to select the LDPC code at the CNU. "The CNU 10GPASS-XR PCS operating on CCDN shall encode the transmitted data using one of the LDPC (FC, FP) codes per Table 101–5, as selected using register TBD."

Suggested Remedy
Strike the phrase ", as selected using register TBD"

Proposed Response: PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Comment Type: E  Comment Status: D

The following sentence needs some grammatical fixes:
"These 66-bit blocks are converted to 65-bit block by removing the redundant first bit (i.e., sync header bit <0>) in each 66-bit block received from the 64B/66B. These 66-bit blocks are converted to 65-bit block by removing the redundant first bit (i.e., sync header bit <0>) in each 66-bit block received from the 64B/66B encoder, which are delivered to the FEC encode and Data Detector input process."

Suggested Remedy
Change from:
"... encoder, which are delivered to ..."
to:
"... encoder, and are then delivered to ...

So the entire sentence reads:
"These 66-bit blocks are converted to 65-bit block by removing the redundant first bit (i.e., sync header bit <0>) in each 66-bit block received from the 64B/66B encoder, and are then delivered to the FEC encode and Data Detector input process.

Proposed Response: PROPOSED ACCEPT.
IEEE 802.3bn EPON Protocol over Coax (EPoC) TF 1st Task Force review comments

Proposed Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>Response Status</th>
<th>Proposed Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 101 | 101.3.2.5.2 | TR | IMM | PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE | See cmt 2219 (also impacts table 101-4 & 5, Topic = Table 101-4/5) As proposed with the following changes:

Fig 101-6: Given that all numbers (Bq, Fp, Fr ...) are constants, replace the variable name with the actual value (add value for FEC payload block).

Page 106, line 51: omit the sentence "The output codeword is passed to the scrambler." as this conflicts with a similar statement about when data is sent in changed para on Page 107, line 33 & Page 110 Line 1.

Fig 106-10 is on PG 116 not 108. |
| 101 | 101.3.2.5.5 | TR | IMM | PROPOSED ACCEPT | Remain, Duane Huawei Technologies, |

Comment Type: T | Comment Status: D | FIFO_FEC_TX buffer

Editors note at the beginning of this section can be removed.

Replace "Seed" with "0x4732BA" in figure 101-9

Remove the phrase "or other value as provisioned"  "The scrambler is initialized to the hexadecimal value of 0x4732BA or other value as provisioned."

For the PHY link we removed the provisionable seed, can we do this for the MAC data scrambler also?  "The scrambler is initialized to the hexadecimal value of 0x4732BA or other value as provisioned."

SuggestedRemedy

Remove the phrase "or other value as provisioned"

Replace "Seed" with "0x4732BA" in figure 101-9

Editors note at the beginning of this section can be removed.

Proposed Response: PROPOSED ACCEPT. |

Cl | Cl | SC | P | L | # |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>101.3.2.6</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2241</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proposed Response: PROPOSED ACCEPT. |

Cl | Cl | SC | P | L | # |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>101.3.2.5.2</td>
<td>TR</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>2278</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proposed Response: \textbf{PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.}

See cmt 2219 (also impacts table 101-4 & 5, Topic = Table 101-4/5) As proposed with the following changes:

Fig 101-6: Given that all numbers (Bq, Fp, Fr ...) are constants, replace the variable name with the actual value (add value for FEC payload block).

Page 106, line 51: omit the sentence "The output codeword is passed to the scrambler." as this conflicts with a similar statement about when data is sent in changed para on Page 107, line 33 & Page 110 Line 1.

Fig 106-10 is on PG 116 not 108. |

Proposed Response: \textbf{PROPOSED ACCEPT.}

Cl | Cl | SC | P | L | # |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>101.3.2.5.5</td>
<td>TR</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2227</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proposed Response: \textbf{PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.} See cmt 2219 (also impacts table 101-4 & 5, Topic = Table 101-4/5) As proposed with the following changes:

Fig 101-6: Given that all numbers (Bq, Fp, Fr ...) are constants, replace the variable name with the actual value (add value for FEC payload block).

Page 106, line 51: omit the sentence "The output codeword is passed to the scrambler." as this conflicts with a similar statement about when data is sent in changed para on Page 107, line 33 & Page 110 Line 1.

Fig 106-10 is on PG 116 not 108. |

Proposed Response: \textbf{PROPOSED ACCEPT.}
**Comment Type:** T  
**Comment Status:** D  
**Proposed Response:**  
**Response Status:** W  
**PROPOSED ACCEPT.**

"Window size (RP) options are selected from the DS windowing parameter for the CLT (see 45.2.1.108.1). CP and Window sizes shall be selected such that the RP value is less than the CP value."

**SuggestedRemedy**

Change "RP" to "NRP" with RP subscripted.

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

"Window" in 2nd sentence should be lower case

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

**Comment Type:** E  
**Comment Status:** D  
**Proposed Response**  
**Response Status:** W  
**PROPOSED ACCEPT.**

"In addition to meeting the clock jitter requirements given above, the CLT is required to meet the phase noise specifications defined in Table 100-1."

**SuggestedRemedy**

make link live.

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

Section 102.2.3 states:  
"The downstream PHY Link uses a fixed frame format, that shall be aligned with the 128 symbol staggered pilot pattern as described in 101.4.2.5.1."

**SuggestedRemedy**

Change from:

"The scattered pilot pattern is synchronized to the PHY Link as shown in Figure 101–14."

to:

"The scattered pilot pattern shall be synchronized to the PHY Link as shown in Figure 101–14."
Comment Type: E  Comment Status: D
The following statements can be more precise.
*eight predefined pilots* (ln 16)
*eight predefined continuous pilots* (ln 19)

**Suggested Remedy:**
Change to:
*eight continuous pilots around the PHY Link.*

**Proposed Response:**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

---

Comment Type: TR  Comment Status: D
This section is to be updated as per presentation prodan_3bn_01_0914 made at the San Diego meeting.

**Suggested Remedy:**
Replace the entire content of this section with the material in prodan_3bn_10_0914.docx (PDF).

**Proposed Response:**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

---

Comment Type: E  Comment Status: D
In table 101-13, would it be better to have the OFDM window units in us like Ncp instead of ns?

**Suggested Remedy:**
Change first column header to "Direction"

**Proposed Response:**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl 101</th>
<th>SC 4.2.9</th>
<th>P 140</th>
<th>L 8</th>
<th># 2286</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leo, Montreuil</td>
<td>Broadcom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Type ER</td>
<td>Comment Status D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBD should be replaced by 6.4 MHz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Suggested Remedy**
TBD should be replaced by 6.4 MHz

**Proposed Response**
Response Status W
PROPOSED REJECT.
Pending approval by TF.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl 101</th>
<th>SC 4.3.13</th>
<th>P 152</th>
<th>L 4</th>
<th># 2279</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leo, Montreuil</td>
<td>Broadcom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Type T</td>
<td>Comment Status D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In table 101-17, would it be better to have the OFDM window units in us like Ncp instead of ns?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Suggested Remedy**

**Proposed Response**
Response Status W
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Editor classified comment as technical (was blank)
Change to us with 4 significant digits for each entry.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl 101</th>
<th>SC 4.3.3.2</th>
<th>P 145</th>
<th>L 12</th>
<th># 2281</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leo, Montreuil</td>
<td>Broadcom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Type E</td>
<td>Comment Status D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In sentence &quot;burst start and stop TIMES straddle an exclusion band or ...&quot;, should we remove the word TIMES as it can be confusing. The process of placing the burst into OFDM subcarriers and symbol is the 2-D process.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Suggested Remedy**
Remove TIMES

**Proposed Response**
Response Status W
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Change "times" to "markers"
Change in 2 places "time" to "marker"
In Fig 102-1 and elsewhere throughout this clause we say that the PHY Link uses MDIO registers. However, MDIO registers are optional in 802.3 so we should instead refer to variables. Because the PHY Link frame structure relies on 16 bit blocks of data we will also need to create groups of variables that total 16 bits or less.

Suggested Remedy
A proposal for variables and variable group is included in remein_3bn_06_0814.pdf (available in framemaker). Note that all variables and variable groups in this proposal map directly to MDIO registers in terms of bit position within the variable group.

Proposed Response
PROPOSED ACCEPT.
This comment is to be processed first.

There is a conflict in the use of the term "NCP"; in some cases it refers to cyclic prefix length and at other times it refers to Next Codeword Pointer. Search the draft for the term "NCP"; when it refers to next codeword pointer, replace it with "FEC Codeword Pointer". In figures the abbreviation "FCP" may be used.

Suggested Remedy
In Figures 102-1, 102-4 * 102-5 replace "NCP" with "FCP"

Proposed Response
PROPOSED ACCEPT.
(see related comment 2248, Topic - NCP)

DS EMB length should be 64-560b not 65-560b (fig 102-1)
US EMB length should be 64-560b not 32-528b (fig 102-2)

Suggested Remedy
Change to as indicate in both figures

Proposed Response
PROPOSED ACCEPT.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Type</th>
<th>Comment Status</th>
<th>Suggested Remedy</th>
<th>Proposed Response</th>
<th>Response Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Scrambler</td>
<td>Remein Duane</td>
<td>Huawei Technologies,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>This section states:  &quot;The downstream PHY Link uses a fixed frame format, that shall be aligned with the 128 symbol staggered pilot pattern as described in 101.4.2.5.1.&quot;  Section 101.4.2.5.1 states:  &quot;The scattered pilot pattern is synchronized to the PHY Link as shown in Figure 101–14.&quot; Sounds like the proverbial tail chasing dog.</td>
<td>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>This para begins: &quot;The Phy uses an (8x12) array&quot; which implies some implementation and give no reason for this array.</td>
<td>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ER</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Change the sentence to read:  &quot;Conceptually, the Phy uses an 8x12 array to perform interleaving.&quot;</td>
<td>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Surely we don't want to reset the local timestamp in the CNU with every PHY Link reception as stated in the following sentence:

"When the CNU PHY receives a PHY Frame addressed to it or to the broadcast address it shall reset its local clock to the value in the Timestamp plus the value in its Offset register (see ref)."

**Suggested Remedy**

Change to read:

"When a CNU PHY that has TxEnable equal to False receives a PHY Frame addressed to it or to the broadcast address it shall reset its local timestamp to the value in the Timestamp."

**Proposed Response**

Proposal Status: W

**PROPOSED ACCEPT.**

---

Expand Table 102-9 to cover all "special" messages such as PHY Discovery and CNU_ID Assignment.

**Suggested Remedy**

See suggestion in remein_3bn_06_0914.pdf

**Proposed Response**

Proposal Status: W

**PROPOSED ACCEPT.**

---

This statement is no longer needed as the PHY Discovery does not conflict with the PHY Link.

"Once the PHY Discovery window is open the CLT shall refrain from sending PHY Instructions to any single CNU over the downstream PHY Link, which would elicit a Response (i.e., read and write/verify instructions) from a CNU for the duration of the PHY Discovery window, to allow sufficient time for joining CNUs to respond."

**Suggested Remedy**

Strike the sentence.

**Proposed Response**

Proposal Status: W

**PROPOSED ACCEPT.**

---

This was written assuming the PHY Discovery would be a type of EMB, that is no longer a reasonable assumption.

"In the PHY Discovery Response message: the preamble used is the special PHY Discovery Preamble (see 102.4.1.5) and the only data included is the CNU MAC address carried in the MDIO Data fields."

**Suggested Remedy**

Change the statement to read:

"In the PHY Discovery Response message, the preamble used is the PHY Discovery Preamble (see 102.4.1.5) and the only data included is the CNU MAC address."

Note this change is included in remein_3bn_06_0914.pdf

**Proposed Response**

Proposal Status: W

**PROPOSED ACCEPT.**

---

Note to TF - consider cmts w/ Topic "PHY Disc" together
IEEE 802.3bn EPON Protocol over Coax (EPoC) TF 1st Task Force review comments

Proposed Responses

Comment Type  T  Comment Status  D  PHY Disc
We need to refine what is included in the PHY Discovery Response.

SuggestedRemedy

Should only include CNU Mac Address. Change from:
"Included in the PHY Discovery Response is a preamble (see 102.4.1.5), the CNU’s MAC
address and [list of other parameters]."

to:
"Included in the PHY Discovery Response is a preamble (see 102.4.1.5) and the CNU’s
MAC address."

Proposed Response  Response Status  W
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Note to TF - consider cmts w/ Topic "PHY Disc" together

Comment Type  T  Comment Status  D  PHY Disc
This statement is now incorrect based on decisions made in San Diego.
"The second four symbols of the PHY Discovery preamble shall be a duplicate copy of the
first four symbols."

SuggestedRemedy

Change the sentence to read:
"The second symbol of the PHY Discovery preamble shall be a duplicate copy of the first
symbol."

Proposed Response  Response Status  W
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Note to TF - consider cmts w/ Topic "PHY Disc" together

Comment Type  T  Comment Status  D  PHY Disc
We need to describe what actions the CNU takes upon receiving the timing offset variable;
a result of Fine Ranging.

SuggestedRemedy

Add the following text:
"When the CNU receives the PhyTimingOffset variable it shall add the value in the variable
to the local timestamp and reset the PhyTimingOffset variable to zero."

Proposed Response  Response Status  W
PROPOSED ACCEPT.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CI</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Proposed Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>102.4.3.1</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2271</td>
<td><strong>Comment Type</strong> T  <strong>Comment Status</strong> D  <strong>Comment</strong> We have significantly refined our concept of Probing and should update the following sentence &quot;The OFDM symbol which is used for probing shall be defined as a probing symbol.&quot;  <strong>Suggested Remedy</strong> Change to: &quot;Each upstream superframe begins with 5 or 6 symbols, called the Probe Period, designated for probing. Each symbol within the Probe Period is referred to as a probing symbol and the number of symbols in the Probe Period is set via the ProbDur variable (see 45.2.1.110.1).&quot;  <strong>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>102.4.3.3</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2223</td>
<td><strong>Comment Type</strong> E  <strong>Comment Status</strong> D  <strong>Comment</strong> The visual difference between CNU 1 and CNU 2 is minimum and should be enhanced.  <strong>Suggested Remedy</strong> Use a more visually distinctive pattern for CNU 1.  <strong>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>102.4.4</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2267</td>
<td><strong>Comment Type</strong> T  <strong>Comment Status</strong> D  <strong>Comment</strong> Improved definition of CNU link acquisition, link-up and additions for link-down.  <strong>Suggested Remedy</strong> Incorporate changes in remein_3bn_03_0914.pdf  <strong>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Leo, Montreuil**

**Comment Type** E  **Comment Status** D  **Comment** There is a SHALL following a SHOULD.  **Suggested Remedy** Remove one  **Response Status** W  **Proposed Response** Remove requirement ("shall")
### Proposed Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Comment Type</strong></th>
<th><strong>Comment Status</strong></th>
<th><strong>Proposed Response</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2285</strong></td>
<td><strong>E</strong></td>
<td><strong>2285</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cl 102 SC 4.1.3 P 181 L 31</strong></td>
<td><strong>Comment Type</strong></td>
<td><strong>E</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment Status</strong></td>
<td><strong>D</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Suggested Remedy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Should it be: &quot;window at start time&quot;?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed Response</strong></td>
<td><strong>Response Status</strong></td>
<td><strong>W</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>&quot;window start time&quot;</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Comment Type</strong></th>
<th><strong>Comment Status</strong></th>
<th><strong>Proposed Response</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2224</strong></td>
<td><strong>Cl 103 SC 103.2.2.7 P 212 L 30</strong></td>
<td><strong>2224</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment Type</strong></td>
<td><strong>T</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment Status</strong></td>
<td><strong>D</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Suggested Remedy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Way back we added the CHECKSIZE state in the CLT Control Multiplexer state diagram (Figure 103-12) to accommodate TDD. This block is no longer needed and should be removed.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed Response</strong></td>
<td><strong>Response Status</strong></td>
<td><strong>W</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Comment Type</strong></th>
<th><strong>Comment Status</strong></th>
<th><strong>Proposed Response</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2276</strong></td>
<td><strong>Cl 45 SC 2.1.109 P 36 L 1</strong></td>
<td><strong>2276</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment Type</strong></td>
<td><strong>T</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment Status</strong></td>
<td><strong>D</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Suggested Remedy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>45.2.1.109 10GPASS-XR DS OFDM channel center frequency control register 1 through N (Register 1.1902 through 1.19aa) Title implies center frequency of DS OFDM channels 1-N; Content in Table 45-78c is for subcarrier 0 (lower band-edge) of each DS OFDM channel.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed Response</strong></td>
<td><strong>Response Status</strong></td>
<td><strong>W</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>&quot;DS OFDM channel frequency control register 1 through N&quot;</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>On line 4, replace &quot;center frequency&quot; with &quot;lower band edge frequency (subcarrier 0)&quot;</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed Response</strong></td>
<td><strong>Response Status</strong></td>
<td><strong>W</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Change section title to read: &quot;DS OFDM channel frequency control register 1 through N&quot;</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>On line 4, replace &quot;center frequency&quot; with &quot;lower band edge frequency (subcarrier 0)&quot;</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed Response</strong></td>
<td><strong>Response Status</strong></td>
<td><strong>W</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Way back we added the CHECKSIZE state in the CLT Control Multiplexer state diagram (Figure 103-12) to accommodate TDD. This block is no longer needed and should be removed.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Suggested Remedy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Remove state, connect all inputs to SEND FRAME</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed Response</strong></td>
<td><strong>Response Status</strong></td>
<td><strong>W</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IEEE 802.3bn EPON Protocol over Coax (EPoC) TF 1st Task Force review comments

Proposed Responses

**Comment Type** T  **Comment Status** D
45.2.2.209.1 DS OFDM center freq ch1 (1.1902.15:0)

Title implies center frequency of DS OFDM channel 1 instead of frequency of subcarrier 0 for DS channels 1-N (content of clause)

**Suggested Remedy**

Change title to read:
DS OFDM channel 1 through N Subcarrier 0 center frequency control register

Line 32 - Replace "TBD" with "54.0 MHz" (per previous Technical Decision 72)

**Proposed Response** **Response Status** W
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Replacing TBD with 54.0 MHz effectively set the lower limit to 54.025 MHz, is this what we want to do or should we set the minimum to 54.025 MHz?

Also see response to comment 2276 for other changes in this section

**Comment Type** E  **Comment Status** D
This is a question, not a comment. How do we write these registers that control the PHY Link search? Do we need to have a Link first?

**Suggested Remedy**

**Proposed Response** **Response Status** W
PROPOSED REJECT.
Questions cannot be accepted, even in principle; they can be answered though. These registers can only be written by the MDIO interface. If we decide to create variables reflecting these registers then they could be written via the PHY Link via a broadcast message once the CNU has acquired the DS link but before a full duplex link is established. Pay close attention to discussion on related comment 2270 for exciting news about MDIO registers and mapped variables!
**Comment Type** T  **Comment Status** D  **PHD Disc Dur**

Phy Link Frame counter will not work for PHY Discovery start as it is asynchronous to the US Frame, use lower 16 bits of DS timestamp.

**Suggested Remedy**

In table 45-78i Change
"Time of next open PHY Discovery window relative to PHY Frame Counter."

Remove PHY Discovery duration entries in table and descriptive text.

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

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Comment Type** E  **Comment Status** D  **new CNU reg**

Table 45-78j is mistitled

**Suggested Remedy**

Change
"10GPASS-XR new CNU control registers 1-8 bit definitions" to
"10GPASS-XR new CNU control register bit definitions"

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

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

**Comment Type** T  **Comment Status** D  **pre-eq**

Motion #9 from San Diego did not get implemented:
Move to: Instruct the Editors to create registers in Clause 45 to specify CNU upstream pre-equalizer coefficients as two 16 bit registers per subcarrier Clause 101.4.3.12.1.
Note for a description see Draft 0.6, Page 143, Line 36

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

PROPOSED ACCEPT.
We need to make it clear that writing to the US/DS profile descriptor only impacts the offline profile and does not affect the active profile.

Suggested Remedy

On pg 44 line 23 change from:
"The 10GPASS-XR DS profile descriptor control 0 through 1023 registers determine the modulation for the downstream OFDM spectrum". To:
"The 10GPASS-XR DS profile descriptor control 0 through 1023 registers determine the offline modulation settings for the downstream OFDM spectrum"

On pg 46 line 4 change from:
"The 10GPASS-XR US profile descriptor control 0 through 1023 registers determine the modulation for the upstream OFDMA spectrum". To:
"The 10GPASS-XR US profile descriptor control 0 through 1023 registers determine the offline modulation settings for the upstream OFDMA spectrum"

Proposed Response

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Do we need a way to copy the active profile copy to the offline profile? If so this would affect these registers.