IEEE 802.3bn EPON Protocol over Coax (EPoC) TF 1st Working Group recirculation ballot comments

Comment Type: E Comment Status: D ez
>>Insert 45.2.1.4.b before 45.2.1.4.a (as inserted by IEEE Std 802.3by-201x) as follows: "<< - extra " at the end of editorial instructions

SuggestedRemedy
Remove extra "
Similar change on page 29, line 25

Proposed Response Response Status: W
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Comment Type: E Comment Status: D ez
No RO in Table 45-7

SuggestedRemedy
No need to include in the draft amendment

Proposed Response Response Status: W
PROPOSED REJECT.
You only see part of the table, see Section 4 of Std

Comment Type: E Comment Status: D ez
"When set to zero the associated CNU_ID has not been assigned." - when what is set to zero?

SuggestedRemedy
Change "When set to zero the associated CNU_ID has not been assigned." to "When bit 1.1949.15 through 1950.7 form a 24 bit value" - I believe "24 bit" is used as an adjective and should be hyphenated

SuggestedRemedy
Change "24 bit" to "24-bit". Also, scrub the rest of the draft for similar use cases and insert hyphens as needed

Proposed Response Response Status: W
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
fix this instance and any others noticed
Comment Type: "Response in units of 0.25 dBmV/1.6MHz." - missing space between numeric value and units in "1.6MHz"

Suggested Remedy

Insert the missing space. Make sure all values in the draft have a following space before unit. There are multiple instances in the draft (quick search shows at least 10 hits for problems with MHz)

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment 4303

---

Comment Type: Heading "100.2.1.3 PMD_UNITDATA.indication" indicates that PMD_UNITDATA.indication primitive is to be described, yet the text speaks of PMD_SIGNAL.request primitive. Which is it? It seems (based on CMP version) that in D2.0 the text was correct, but it was modified incorrectly in D2.0

Suggested Remedy

Please revert text from D2.0 - it was correct. Current text is NOT. Current text seems to be repetition of text from 100.2.1.4 PMD_SIGNAL.request

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Draft 2.1: Page 76, paragraph from lines 32 to 35. Replace entire paragraph with the paragraph from Draft 2.0, Page 86, Lines 36 through 38.

---

Comment Type: "This variable is set to TRUE if the CNU calculation of DS_DataRate differs from the DS_DataRate calculation communicated from the CLT by more than 10 b/s otherwise the variable is set to FALSE" - it seems that there should be "," or ";" before the word "otherwise" to separate two independent portions of the sentence

Suggested Remedy

Insert "," in indicated location in the description of DS_RateMatchFail and US_RateMatchFail variables

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Draft 2.1: Page 80, paragraph from lines 36 to 38. Replace entire paragraph with the paragraph from Draft 2.0, Page 86, Lines 36 through 38.

---

Comment Type: "Equipment conforming to this standard shall clearly mark." - equipment is typically labelled, not marked

Suggested Remedy

Change "Equipment conforming to this standard shall clearly mark." to "Equipment conforming to this standard shall be clearly labelled with information about the"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Draft 2.1: Page 80, paragraph from lines 36 to 38. Replace entire paragraph with the paragraph from Draft 2.0, Page 86, Lines 36 through 38.

---

Comment Type: The CLT can only ensure it once: "The CLT ensures ensure the following"

Suggested Remedy

Change to "The CLT ensures the following"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.
Looking at Figure 101–1, 4 out of 5 instances of CPW are marked as "CPW5" - I believe the numbers on individual CPW instances should match numbers on IDFT i.e., 2, 3, 4, and 5. The same observation applies to INTERLEAVING & PILOT INSERTION blocks, 4 out of 5 of which are also labeled as "5".

**Suggested Remedy**

Fix numbers for CPW and INTERLEAVING & PILOT INSERTION blocks

Similar numbering problems exist in Figure 101-3 for FFT and DE-INTERLEAVING blocks

**Proposed Response**

Response Status: W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

---

Extra "\" character in "FAST FOURIER TRANSFORM",

**Suggested Remedy**

remove the extra "\"

**Proposed Response**

Response Status: W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

---

Inconsistent formatting for "DS_PHY_OSize" variable. I suspect it was intended to be all in italics.

**Suggested Remedy**

Per comment

**Proposed Response**

Response Status: W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.
IEEE 802.3bn EPON Protocol over Coax (EPoC) TF 1st Working Group recirculation ballot comments

**Comment 4217**

**Cl 101 SC 101.3.2.5.7 P 145 L 16 # 4217**

Hajduczenia, Marek
Bright House Networks

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

Incorrect format for NOTE: "Note: in the CLT the lastcodeword argument to this function is always TRUE (see Figure 101–12)." - please apply a correct style

**Suggested Remedy**

Per comment

Also, three locations in 101.4.2.1.2

**Proposed Response**

Response Status W

PROPOSED REJECT.

The text is using Paragraph Tag "Note" as are the two notes in 101.4.2.1.2 (the editor cannot find a third note in 101.4.2.1.2). This is consistent with the WG template.

**Comment 4219**

**Cl 101 SC 101.3.3.1.6 P 153 L 30 # 4219**

Hajduczenia, Marek
Bright House Networks

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

Missing "is" in "This variable used for counting bits in the Transfer from PMA process."

**Suggested Remedy**

Change to "This variable is used for counting bits in the Transfer from PMA process."

**Proposed Response**

Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Comment 4223**

**Cl 101 SC 101.4.3.4.5 P 165 L 44 # 4223**

Hajduczenia, Marek
Bright House Networks

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

We do avoid the use of "will" apart from some very specific cases - this is not it: "the PHY will treat the subcarrier as null"

**Suggested Remedy**

Change "the PHY will treat the subcarrier as null" to "the PHY treats the subcarrier as null"

**Proposed Response**

Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Comment 4227**

**Cl 101 SC 101.4.3.13 P 188 L 46 # 4227**

Hajduczenia, Marek
Bright House Networks

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

Missing full stop after "downstream Frequency Band as per Table 100–3" in Table 101-12

**Suggested Remedy**

Add missing "."

**Proposed Response**

Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Comment 4232**

**Cl 101 SC 101.4.5.2 P 214 L 5 # 4232**

Hajduczenia, Marek
Bright House Networks

**Comment Type E** **Comment Status D ez, Black Sq**

Figure 101-40, Figure 101-41, Figure 101-42, and others have black squares, which I believe were intended to be dots.

**Suggested Remedy**

Please redraw in Frame to make squares look like proper dots

**Proposed Response**

Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See remen_3bn_10_1115 and Comments #4276 and #4311.

**Comment 4246**

**Cl 103 SC 103.2.2.1 P 297 L 11 # 4246**

Hajduczenia, Marek
Bright House Networks

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

Incorrect multiplication symbol in DS_FEC_CW_Sz_FRAC[]

**Suggested Remedy**

Change "\(^*\)\) to proper "\(^*\)" multiplication symbol

**Proposed Response**

Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

(Ctl Q 0)
Proposed Response

#4249

Cl 103 SC 103.2.2.1 P 297 L 50 # 4249

Hajduczenia, Marek
Bright House Networks

Comment Type E
Comment Status D ez

Type "TYPE:Unsigned integer" should be "TYPE: unsigned integer"

Suggested Remedy

Per comment

Proposed Response
Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

#4251

Cl 103 SC 103.2.2.7 P 303 L 1 # 4251

Hajduczenia, Marek
Bright House Networks

Comment Type E
Comment Status D ez

Different fonts (Times and Arial) in the same SD

Suggested Remedy

Compare states ADVANCE_BY_1 and START_DERATING_TIMER - I understand that either is allowed, but let's not mix them on the same SD. They just look odd.

Proposed Response
Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Use Arial

#4252

Cl 103 SC 103.3.3.1 P 311 L 26 # 4252

Hajduczenia, Marek
Bright House Networks

Comment Type E
Comment Status D ez

"8 bit" in "8 bit unsigned integer" is an adjective and should be hyphenated

Suggested Remedy

Change "8 bit unsigned integer" to "8-bit unsigned integer" globally

Proposed Response
Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

#4255

Cl 103 SC 103.3.5.1 P 320 L 41 # 4255

Hajduczenia, Marek
Bright House Networks

Comment Type E
Comment Status D ez

"VALUE: 0x03B9ACA0 (1 s)" - division of a value into 8 bit groups with - helps with readability

Suggested Remedy

Consider changing larger hex values to 0xaahh-bbcccc-ddd format.
Here, change "VALUE: 0x03B9ACA0 (1 s)" to "VALUE: 0x03-B9-AC-A0 (1 s)"

Proposed Response
Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Here and also pg 252 line 11 and pg 321 line 37

#4261

Cl 45 SC 45.2.1.4 P 29 L 20 # 4261

Marris, Arthur
Cadence Design Syste

Comment Type E
Comment Status D ez

45.2.1.4.b should be inserted after 45.2.1.4.a

Suggested Remedy

Make editing instruction on line 20:
"Insert 45.2.1.4.b after 45.2.1.4.a (as inserted by IEEE Std 802.3by-201x) as follows:"

Delete the "Reserved for future speeds" row from Table 45-6 so only the "10GPASS-XR capable" row remains.

Make editing instruction on line 3:
"Insert a new row in Table 45-6 below the row for 1.4.11 as inserted by IEEE Std 802.3by-201x as follows (unchanged rows not shown):"

Proposed Response
Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Comment ID 4261 Page 5 of 9

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Comment ID
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Comment Type</th>
<th>Comment Status</th>
<th>SuggestedRemedy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100A</td>
<td>100A.2</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4265</td>
<td>ER</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Fix case and TLA problems in table notes for Table 100A-1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Line 9, NOTE 4: lower case &quot;Frequency&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Line 12, NOTE 7: lower case words &quot;Reference, Live Video&quot; and &quot;Interference&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Line 14, NOTE 8: lower case words &quot; Worst Case Frequency; Good&quot; and &quot;Analog&quot;, expand &quot;PAR&quot; to &quot;peak-to-average ratio (PAR)&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Line 17 and 18, NOTE 10: lower case &quot;Bandwidth&quot; and &quot;Levels&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Line 18, NOTE 10: &quot;ReDesign&quot; comes up in searching for &quot;ReDesign channel model&quot; on the web suggesting this is referencing something. AIP this comment to add an appropriate reference and/or change. (Have to check with experts to find out what this means.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Line 20, NOTE 11: lower case &quot;Clipping&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Line 21, NOTE 12: lower case &quot;Minimum&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Line 22, NOTE 13: lower case &quot;Single Dominant&quot; and &quot;Does&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Line 23, NOTE 14: lower case &quot;Definition, Echo&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Line 24, NOTE 15: lower case &quot;Basis&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ER</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Fix case and TLA problems in table notes for Table 100A-2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Line 10, NOTE 1: lower case &quot;Loss&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Line 12, NOTE 3: change &quot;DS&quot; to &quot;downstream&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Line 14, NOTE 4: lower case &quot;Report&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Line 17, NOTE 6: lower case &quot;Upstream&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Line 18, NOTE 7: lower case &quot;Single Dominant&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Line 19, NOTE 8: lower case &quot;Definition, Echo&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Comment Type</th>
<th>Comment Status</th>
<th>SuggestedRemedy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100A</td>
<td>100A.1</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4268</td>
<td>ER</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Strengthen the relationship of the topology to the baseline channel conditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Change: &quot;The normative EPoC OFDM channel parameters are based on the topology shown in Figure 100A-1&quot; to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;The normative EPoC baseline channel conditions and OFDM channel parameters are referenced to the topology shown in Figure 100A-1&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TE</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reword as only one upstream OFDMA channel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Comment Type</th>
<th>Comment Status</th>
<th>SuggestedRemedy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>100.3.3</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4269</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Mistype, comment is regarding Page 108, Line 42. Otherwise, as per comment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Add cross references for Clause 103 to two places in Clause 30.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Comment Type</th>
<th>Comment Status</th>
<th>SuggestedRemedy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>30.3.5.1.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4270</td>
<td>ER</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Insert editing directives to IEEE editor(s) for &quot;30.3.5.1.2 aMPCPAdminState&quot; AND &quot;30.3.5.1.3 aMPCPMode&quot; to add Clause 103 to cross references: i.e. change in Clause 64 or Clause 77 to &quot;in Clause 64, Clause 77, or Clause 103&quot;.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PROPOSED ACCEPT.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID</th>
<th>CI</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>Comment Type</th>
<th>Comment Status</th>
<th>Proposed Response</th>
<th>Response Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4272</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>100.3.4</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>First uses of &quot;OFDM Symbol Clock&quot; in Clause 100 and 101 needs a cross reference to 101.4.3.2.</td>
<td>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4274</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>102.2.3.1.4</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Supurious period in figure title removed.</td>
<td>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4297</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45.2.1.4.b</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>&quot;comprising of&quot; is poor english.</td>
<td>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4298</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>1.4.294b</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>&quot;A optical&quot; should be &quot;An optical&quot; &quot;fiber optical&quot; does not occur in 802.3 whereas &quot;fiber optic&quot; occurs 438 times</td>
<td>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4300</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30.3.2.1.2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>&quot;Clause 101&quot; should be a cross-reference here and on line 27</td>
<td>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4301</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45.2.1.4.b</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>&quot;Insert 45.2.1.4.b before 45.2.1.4.a&quot; should be &quot;Insert 45.2.1.4.b after 45.2.1.4.a&quot; Also, there is a spurious &quot; at the end of the editing instruction and also at the end of the subclause text.</td>
<td>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment ID: 4301
The P802.3bw draft (which has completed sponsor ballot) has inserted 45.2.1.14a for register 1.18. As register 1.17 is before this, 45.2.1.14a should be 45.2.1.14aa.

Same issue for Table 45-17a which has to be Table 45-17aa

Suggested Remedy
Renumber 45.2.1.14a to be 45.2.1.14aa and Table 45-17a to be Table 45-17aa

Suggested Remedy
"0.25 dBmV/1.6MHz"
There should always be a (non-breaking) space between a number and its unit. Also, the draft is inconsistent as to whether there are spaces either side of the /

Suggested Remedy
Change this instance from "0.25 dBmV/1.6MHz" to "0.25 dBmV / 1.6 MHz" using non-breaking spaces (Ctrl space) for all four spaces to ensure that it does not break across two lines. Go through the rest of the draft to make all other instances of similar text consistent.

Suggested Remedy
100.2.11 CLT upstream receive modulation error ratio requirements follows 100.2.10 CLT receiver requirements while 100.2.12.3 Receive modulation error ratio requirements comes under 100.2.12 CNU receiver requirements.

Suggested Remedy
Put 100.2.11 under 100.2.10.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CI</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>L</th>
<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>100</td>
<td>100.2</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>ER</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Line 30 uses log (sub) 10, yet line 42 uses log 10. Are these supposed to be the same?</td>
<td>PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Line 42 contains no math. Assumption is comparison of line 30 and line 34. On checking the DOCSIS PHY D3.1 spec, the &quot;10&quot; in &quot;log10&quot; should be subscript. Change: Line 30, insert a times symbol between the &quot;10&quot; and the &quot;log10&quot; as similar in Line 34. Line 34, subscript the &quot;10&quot; in &quot;log10&quot;.</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Carlson, Steve  
High Speed Design Inc.