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

Proposed Responses

Cl 45 SC 45.2.1.4.b P 29 L 20 # 4184
Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks

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.

Cl 45 SC 45.2.1.6 P 30 L 14 # 4185
Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks

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

Cl 45 SC 45.2.1.141.1 P 40 L 4 # 4186
Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks

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 1.1915.15 is set to zero the associated CNU_ID has not been assigned."

Proposed Response Response Status W
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
use "When this bits is set to zero …"

Cl 45 SC 45.2.1.142.3 P 40 L 52 # 4187
Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks

Comment Type TR Comment Status D ez
There is NO reason to indicate why something is reserved. There can be hundreds of reasons why these bits might be used and it is not the role of the TF to restrict how future amendments are done (or not)

SuggestedRemedy
remove 45.2.1.142.3

Proposed Response Response Status W
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Change these from Reserved to "MAC Add Expansion" in Table 45-98I in 45.2.1.142.3 change to:
"Bits 1.1920.15 are intended to be used for bits [63:48] of the MAC address in the event the MAC address is expanded to 64 bits. Until this expansion occurs these bits are always zero and ignored on receipt."

Cl 45 SC 45.2.1.147 P 42 L 37 # 4188
Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks

Comment Type E Comment Status D ez formatted
"UQ34.3 formatted number" - I believe it is "formatted" and not "formated"

SuggestedRemedy
Change all instances of "formatted" to "formatted"

Proposed Response Response Status W
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 45 SC 45.2.1.149 P 43 L 45 # 4189
Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks

Comment Type E Comment Status D ez
"NMW = Multi-word" - only MW is used in the table

SuggestedRemedy
Change "NMW" to "MW" - scrub the rest of the draft

Proposed Response Response Status W
PROPOSED ACCEPT.
only one instance in draft
Proposed Responses

Proposed Response

Comment ID 4190
Cl 45 SC 45.2.1.162.1 P 48 L 28
Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks

Comment Type E Comment Status D ez

"Bits 1.1949.15:0 through 1950.7:0 form a 24 bit value" - I believe "24 bit" is used as an adjective and should be hyphenated

Suggested Remedy

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

Proposed Response

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

fix this instance and any others noticed

Comment ID 4191
Cl 45 SC 45.2.1.163.2 P 49 L 10
Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks

Comment Type E Comment Status D ez

"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

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment 4303

Comment ID 4192
Cl 45 SC 45.2.1.165 P 50 L 1
Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks

Comment Type E Comment Status D

Footnote separated from the table

Suggested Remedy

Please make sure footnotes do not get separated from the tables

Proposed Response

PROPOSED REJECT.

Tables will continue to shift until very close to final draft, and maybe not even then. I know of no easy way to fix this (I tried several), especially without causing excessive white space which the commenter has objected to before. Consider resubmitting this comment near the end of Sponsor Ballot.

Comment ID 4193
Cl 45 SC 45.2.1.166.3 P 51 L 23
Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

"Bits 1.1959.14:0 indicate which CNU the CLT is to measure the received power on." - there is no information on how these CNUs are identified, i.e., what value is inserted into this register

Suggested Remedy

Provide information on how the CNU is being identified.

Proposed Response

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change to:
"When set to a CNU_ID bits 1.1959.14:0 indicate ..."

Change xRef to 100.3.3.1.

Update RxPwr_CINU_ID pg 109 line 16 from
"This variable indicates ..." to
"When set to a CNU_ID this variable indicates ..." and eliminate dup entry for this variable.

Comment ID 4194
Cl 45 SC 45.2.7a.5.3 P 56 L 22
Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks

Comment Type TR Comment Status D

This does not read right: "Bits 12.10241.14:0 indicate which CNU on which to measure the MER and report in registers 12.10242 through 12.12287"

Suggested Remedy

Change to: "Bits 12.10241.14:0 indicate the CNU on which to measure the MER and report in registers 12.10242 through 12.12287.

Add also information on how this CNU is identified - there is no information on this right now.

Proposed Response

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change to:
"Bits 12.10241.14:0 indicate the CNU_ID of the CNU on which to measure the MER and report in registers 12.10242 through 12.12287."
Cl 100 SC 100.1.3 P 71 L 46 # 4195
Hajduczenia, Marek
Bright House Networks

Comment Type: E
Comment Status: D
Discussed

"mode, is defined in clause, with downstream data rate calculation in 100.2.6.1" - which Clause is it defined in?

Suggested Remedy
Provide information on which clause the said PMD is defined in (likely, Clause 100)

Proposed Response
Response Status: W
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
The next sentence on upstream is more clear and says "in this clause". Looks like the "this" is missing from the downstream.

For line 46, change "in clause" to "in this clause".

Cl 100 SC 100.1.4 P 73 L 3 # 4196
Hajduczenia, Marek
Bright House Networks

Comment Type: E
Comment Status: D
Discussed

Dead link: "numbered register for Clause 45 registers." - no way to check all of them in PDF

Suggested Remedy
Please scrub the draft and make sure all links are live / active.

Proposed Response
Response Status: W
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
2. Do a sanity check on xrefs in the clause.

Cl 100 SC 100.2.1.3 P 76 L 33 # 4197
Hajduczenia, Marek
Bright House Networks

Comment Type: TR
Comment Status: D
Discussed

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 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.

Cl 100 SC 100.2.6.3 P 80 L 8 # 4198
Hajduczenia, Marek
Bright House Networks

Comment Type: E
Comment Status: EZ

"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.

Cl 100 SC 100.2.7 P 80 L 19 # 4199
Hajduczenia, Marek
Bright House Networks

Comment Type: T
Comment Status: EZ

"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.

Cl 100 SC 100.2.8.2 P 82 L 15 # 4200
Hajduczenia, Marek
Bright House Networks

Comment Type: E
Comment Status: D
Discussed

Wrong format for a NOTE

Suggested Remedy
Please use the proper style of text that is intended to be marked as an informative NOTE

Multiple instances in the document

Proposed Response
Response Status: W
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Change to note format. Other instances in the draft will be correct if noticed.
IEEE 802.3bn EPON Protocol over Coax (EPoC) TF 1st Working Group recirculation ballot comments

Draft 2.1

Proposed Responses

Cl 100 SC 100.2.9.3 P 90 L 21 # 4201

Hajduczenia, Marek
Bright House Networks

Comment Type E Comment Status D
SuggestedRemedy
Change to "The CLT ensures the following"

Proposed Response Response Status W
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 100 SC 100.2.9.3.1 P 90 L 42 # 4202

Hajduczenia, Marek
Bright House Networks

Comment Type ER Comment Status D
SuggestedRemedy
It is not clear what the purpose of Variables is here - there are no SDs to describe this function.

Proposed Response Response Status W
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
ReportedPwr is communicated across the PHY Link from each CNU to the CLT.

Pg 90 line 20 add:
"The CNU shall report its transmit power using the variable ReportedPwr when requested by the CLT."
Update PICS

Cl 100 SC 100.2.9.4.2 P 93 L 34 # 4203

Hajduczenia, Marek
Bright House Networks

Comment Type ER Comment Status D
SuggestedRemedy
"P1scaled = P1 × (0.4 MHz)/(Measurement Bandwidth (MHz) used in Table 100-7)" - this is incomprehensible. If this is equation, what is the purpose of MHz in it? If it is expected to be descriptive, then these all items should be bulleted and formatted accordingly

Proposed Response Response Status W
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
See comment #4314
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CI</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>100.2.12.3</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4206</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment ID:** 4206

**Comment Type:** E

**Comment Status:** D

**Comment:** Fancy shady background in Figure 100-4 in individual function blocks

**Suggested Remedy:**

Redraw with no color in individual boxes and addition symbols, at best in Frame (seems like it is external drawing right now)

**Proposed Response:**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #4310

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CI</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>00</td>
<td>101.1.4</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4207</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment ID:** 4207

**Page:** 5 of 28

**Comment Type:** TR

**Comment Status:** D

**Comment:** Looking at Figure 101–1, there is only one instance of PMD_UNITDATA.request(tx_unit), which seems to be the same for each CPW talking to PMD FUNCTIONS block. PMD_UNITDATA does not have any indication which of the individual functional blocks is delivering data - how can them PMD FUNCTIONS make any sense of it?

**Suggested Remedy:**

Consider labelling individual instances of PMD_UNITDATA, e.g., by changing "PMD_UNITDATA.request(tx_unit)" to "PMD_UNITDATA.request(tx_unit, lane_nbr)" and using CPW instance number as parameter - these are just descriptive primitives

Similiar issue exists in Figure 101-3 but this time with PMD_UNITDATA.indication(tx_unit) primitive

**Proposed Response:**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Was CI 101

In CI 100 Pg 76 line 20 change

"The semantics of the service primitive are PMD_UNITDATA.request(I_value, Q_value). The data conveyed by PMD_UNITDATA.request is a continuous stream of I / Q value pairs. Both I_value and Q_value are encoded as 32-bit signed integers." to

"The semantics of the service primitive are PMD_UNITDATA.request(I_value, Q_value, ChNum). The data conveyed by PMD_UNITDATA.request is a continuous stream of I / Q value pairs. Both I_value and Q_value are encoded as 32-bit signed integers. ChNum indicates which one of five channels the PMD_UNITDATA.request is for."

Pg 77 line 4 change

PMD_UNITDATA.request(I_value, Q_value) to

PMD_UNITDATA.request(I_value, Q_value, ChNum).

In Figure 101-1 change

PMD_UNITDATA.request(tx_unit) to

PMD_UNITDATA.request

Make similar changes for PMD_UNITDATA.indication
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Comment Type</th>
<th>Comment Status</th>
<th>Suggested Remedy</th>
<th>Proposed Response</th>
<th>Comment Status</th>
<th>Response Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4208</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>TR</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>ez</td>
<td>Fix numbers for CPW and INTERLEAVING &amp; PILOT INSERTION blocks</td>
<td>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4209</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>ez</td>
<td>remove the extra &quot;&quot;</td>
<td>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4210</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>Change to &quot;See 76.2.&quot;</td>
<td>PROPOSED REJECT.</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4211</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>Inconsistent formatting for &quot;DS_PHY_OSize&quot; variable. I suspect it was intended to be all in italics.</td>
<td>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4212</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>ER</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>Please use the proper font for SDs, per IEEE Style Manual, Table 1</td>
<td>PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4213</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>Change to ((1800+40)/65). However this will be inconsistent with previous practice.</td>
<td>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Draft 2.1**

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

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

### Proposed Responses

**Comment ID:** 4214

**Proposed Response:**

*Comment Status:* D

*Response Status:* W

**Hajduczenia, Marek**

Bright House Networks

**Comment Type:** E

**Signal:** Missing "=" symbol in "bits<1:32> the current PHY Link timestamp" - for consistency with the surrounding text

**Suggested Remedy:**

Change "bits<1:32> the current PHY Link timestamp" to "bits<1:32> = the current PHY Link timestamp"

**PROPOSED ACCEPT.**

---

**Comment ID:** 4215

**Proposed Response:**

*Comment Status:* D

*Response Status:* W

**Hajduczenia, Marek**

Bright House Networks

**Comment Type:** ER

**Signal:** The text of the PDF when copied into clipboard contains a lot of unprintable characters:

- BurstTimeHeader()
- The BurstTimeHeader() function returns a 65-bit vector with the following values:
  - bit <0> = binary 1
  - bits<1:32> the current PHY Link timestamp
  - bits<33:64> = a fixed value of 0xD858E4AB.
- This 65-bit vector is transmitted as the first 65-bit block of an upstream burst.

**Suggested Remedy:**

This is the only draft currently in circulation that has this issue - it was not present in D2.0. Please fix it!

Having to remove such garbage from text every time anything is copied from the document is annoying and time consuming.

**Proposed Response**

*Response Status:* W

**PROPOSED REJECT.**

The text in question uses Paragraph Tag "DefinitionList" per the current template. Copying and pasting from the template example includes the same "unprintable character" (which is a manual line break). This is consistent with the current template. The commenter is invited to discuss this with the TF/WG editors if this is indeed an issue which is considered blocking for publication.

---

**Comment ID:** 4216

**Proposed Response**

*Comment Status:* D

*Response Status:* W

**Hajduczenia, Marek**

Bright House Networks

**Comment Type:** T

**Signal:** "ARRAY_IN[] to the PMA using" - since you do not expect ARRAY_IN to be empty, it should be referenced by name without empty []

**Suggested Remedy:**

Change "ARRAY_IN[] to the PMA using" to "ARRAY_IN to the PMA using"

**PROPOSED ACCEPT.**

---

**Comment ID:** 4217

**Proposed Response**

*Comment Status:* D

*Response Status:* W

**Hajduczenia, Marek**

Bright House Networks

**Comment Type:** E

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

Proposed Responses

Cl 101 SC 101.3.2.5.8 P 146 L 17 # 4218
Hajduczenia, Marek
Bright House Networks

Comment Type ER Comment Status D
ELSE, Else, or else?

Suggested Remedy
Please use consistent capitalization. The same applies to UTC, TRUE, FALSE, which just makes it harder for a reader to figure out whether true and TRUE when used on the same SD are the same or not ...

Proposed Response Response Status W
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Change 2 instances of "true" to "TRUE" (pg 146 ln 16 & 155 ln 7) and 1 instance of "false" to "FALSE" (pg 142 line 27) as the TF agree to use these exclusively some time ago.
UTC only appear as such.
ELSE, Else, & else are all used in the standard as was noted in rejected "E" comment # 3839 against draft 2.0 and will not be changed.

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.

Cl 101 SC 101.3.3.1.8 P 154 L 19 # 4220
Hajduczenia, Marek
Bright House Networks

Comment Type TR Comment Status D discussed
Two exit conditions from PMA_CLIENT not needed, especially that they end up in the same state anyway

Suggested Remedy
Remove one of transitions and change condition on the other one to "PMA_CLK * (burstEnd = TRUE & burstEdn = FALSE)"

Proposed Response Response Status W
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
The path from PMA_CLK * burstEnd = FALSE should return to state PMA_CLIENT not WAIT_FOR_CALL.

Cl 101 SC 101.3.3.1.8 P 155 L 36 # 4221
Hajduczenia, Marek
Bright House Networks

Comment Type T Comment Status D
If you use the if/else statement within state diagram states, it would be helpful to identify the end/start of a multi-line block with {}.

Suggested Remedy
In state DECOR_FAIL, surround

```
tx_code<0>
	dataOut<8>
```

with {}.

Proposed Response Response Status W
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
In order to maintain consistency with other SD's indent these more (6 non breaking spaces).

Cl 101 SC 101.4.3.2 P 162 L 54 # 4222
Hajduczenia, Marek
Bright House Networks

Comment Type TR Comment Status D
Footnote b) is completely pointless. If sub-30 second acquisition time is expected, make it a requirement. Otherwise, it is meaningless - the requirement is for up to 60 seconds. There are no shades of gray here.

Suggested Remedy
Strike footnote b)

Proposed Response Response Status W
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CI</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>Comment Type</th>
<th>Comment Status</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Proposed Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>101.4.3.6.5</td>
<td>ER</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>CntPltSF is only used in equation 101-9 and should be defined under the equation and not in a separate subclause.</td>
<td>PROPOSED REJECT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>101.4.3.9.2</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Designations in the figure would be clearer to read if there was a multiplication symbol between J and numeric value</td>
<td>PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>101.4.3.12.1</td>
<td>ER</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Unnecessary redirection: values are expressed in &quot;samples&quot; which are later one explained to be &quot;samples refers to OFDM Clock periods (1/204.8 MHz)&quot;</td>
<td>PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>101.4.3.13</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Missing full stop after &quot;downstream Frequency Band as per Table 100–3&quot; in Table 101-12</td>
<td>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>101.4.3.14</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Figure 101–31 seems to contain a lot of &quot;squeezed&quot; text, where transition condition text is very close to the edge of the state block. Transitions out of COUNT_RB_SYMBOLS state are very good examples</td>
<td>PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE; For state transitions beginning with &quot;SCLK&quot; try to enter the text between the state and the transition line being very careful not to merge the underscened with the transition line.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Despite various attempts, I could not locate what "FILLWORD<>" is and what it represents. It is a very odd notation. What is even more confusing is that there seem to be two notations: FILLWORD and FillWord used and it's not clear whether they are one and the same or not.

**Suggested Remedy**

Use consistent notation if FILLWORD and FillWord are intended to be the same.

Also, when referencing array, you could just say "array FillWord" or just "FillWord" with proper formatting and that will point to it being a variable, and cause reader to look for its definition.

**PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.**

Use "FillWord" in all instances (9x) without "<>" unless referring to specific bits.

Is there any specific reason why values for END enumeration are shown in ""? In all other locations, values are not marked in any specific way.

**Suggested Remedy**

Remove "" from END variable definition

**PROPOSED ACCEPT.**

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 ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.**

See remein_3bn_10_1115 and Comments #4276 and #4311.

**Comment Type:** TR

**Comment Status:** D

**Response Status:** W

**Comment Type:** E

**Comment Status:** D

**Response Status:** W
Proposed Responses

**Cl 101 SC 101.4.5.3 P 214 L 23 # 4233**

Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks

**Comment Type**: ER  
**Comment Status**: D

**SuggestedRemedy**:  
Some of the symbols are 6-point and very hard to read. Please increase the font size!  
The problem persists in multiple equations in the draft, specially at the end of Clause 101

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

**Cl 101 SC 101.5 P 218 L 11 # 4236**  
Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks

**Comment Type**: ER  
**Comment Status**: D

**SuggestedRemedy**:  
Change “defined in 802.1as, clause 13.1.4” to “defined in IEEE Std 802.1AS, 13.1.4”

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

**Cl 101 SC 101.5 P 218 L 11 # 4237**  
Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks

**Comment Type**: ER  
**Comment Status**: D

**SuggestedRemedy**:  
Title of 101.5 is incorrect - an 802.3 project cannot create extensions to 802.1AS standard

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

**Cl 101 SC 101.5 P 218 L 11 # 4238**  
Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks

**Comment Type**: ER  
**Comment Status**: D

**SuggestedRemedy**:  
IEEE Std 802.1AS is not included in normative references for latest IEEE Std 802.3 and this amendment

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

**Cl 101 SC 101.5 P 218 L 11 # 4239**  
Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks

**Comment Type**: ER  
**Comment Status**: D

**SuggestedRemedy**:  
Optional requirements??? "for EPoC the following future time at the future MPCP frame should be substituted for ToDX,i:" and "each CNUi should correct the xxx future time value received from the CLT for its own CNU PHY time delay asymmetry as follows"

**Proposed Response**: Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
Add to the end of the para in 101.5:  
"Devices intended to be used for time synchronization should use the variables and methods described in this 101.5.1, 101.5.2 and 101.5.3."  
(Note comment #4239 moved 101.5.4 to 101.5.3)

**Proposed Response**: Response Status W  
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
Add PICs statement:  
G8 | Time synchronization support | 101.5.1 | Variables and methods described in 101.5.4.1, 101.5.4.2, and 101.5.4.3 supported.
IEEE 802.3bn EPON Protocol over Coax (EPoC) TF 1st Working Group recirculation ballot comments

Proposed Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>101.5.3</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>101.5.1</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>101.5.4</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>101.5.2</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4240</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hajduczenia, Marek
Bright House Networks

Comment Type  ER  Comment Status  D  Discussed

Standard do not need to explain how specific values / formulas were obtained. If the material was presented and it is publicly available, it is sufficient to have the specific calculations available there for future references.

Suggested Remedy

Remove 101.5.3

Proposed Response  Response Status  W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Add at the beginning of 101.5.3

"The following material is provided to assist IEEE Std 802.1AS users in understanding changes to IEEE Std 802.3AS, 13.1.4 needed for effective time synchronization within the EPoC environment. This subsection illustrates the intended use of the time variables defined in 101.5.3 and the derivation of this time synchronization methodology for EPoC."

(Note comment #4239 moved 101.5.4 to 101.5.3)

Comment Type  TR  Comment Status  D  Discussed, variable def location

Variables should be defined in equations and not create separate subclause for them, and then cross reference them from within definitions under equations.

Suggested Remedy

Move definitions of individual variables to where they are first defined under equations 101-38 and 101-39

Proposed Response  Response Status  W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Our convention is that all managed variables are formally defined in a separate subclause as is the case here.

Move Clause 101.5.4 above current 101.5.3 Derivation of Methodology so it is close to the equations where it is used.

Comment Type  T  Comment Status  D  Discussed

What is "xxx" in "each CNUi should correct the xxx" ???

Suggested Remedy

Seems that "xxx" can be removed without any loss of information

Proposed Response  Response Status  W

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

Proposed Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CI</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Comment ID</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Bright House Networks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>101.5.2</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>TR</td>
<td>4243</td>
<td>Hajduczenia, Marek</td>
<td>Bright House Networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>ER</td>
<td>4244</td>
<td>Hajduczenia, Marek</td>
<td>Bright House Networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>103.2.2.1</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>4245</td>
<td>Hajduczenia, Marek</td>
<td>Bright House Networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>103.2.2.1</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>TR</td>
<td>4246</td>
<td>Hajduczenia, Marek</td>
<td>Bright House Networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>103.2.2.1</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>TR</td>
<td>4247</td>
<td>Hajduczenia, Marek</td>
<td>Bright House Networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>103.2.2.1</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>TR</td>
<td>4248</td>
<td>Hajduczenia, Marek</td>
<td>Bright House Networks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment 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

Comment ID 4243
Based on the existing text in 101.5.2 and also equation 101-39, it is not clear what time reference value the CNU should be correcting: ToD_EPOC_CLTXi received from the CLT? Local time from the CNU? The way the equation is structured right now, it seems that the CNU calculates the value of ToD_EPOC_CLTXi, which is also calculated in 101-38.

Suggested Remedy
- The utility of equation 101-39 is unclear.

Proposed Response
- PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See Response to comment #4242

Comment ID 4244
CMP version of the draft is useless - most of figures are not marked correctly (hard to figure out which figure was added and which was removed). Also, there is no clear indication of what was modified in PICS

Suggested Remedy
- Given the scope of recirculation is limited to changed text only, without clear CMP file it is hard to judge what was modified and what was NOT

Proposed Response
- PROPOSED REJECT.
- (no possible change to draft).
- The CMP file is generated by FrameMaker and is provided for convenience only.

Comment ID 4245
Can DS_FEC_CW_Sz be negative? Similarly, DS_FEC_Prty_Sz, DS_FEC_Pld_Sz, and other variables which clearly have only positive values

Suggested Remedy
- Change type to "unsigned integer"

Proposed Response
- PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
- Change the listed variables to unsigned integer

Comment ID 4246
Incorrect multiplication symbol in DS_FEC_CW_Sz_FRAC

Suggested Remedy
- Change "*" to proper "x" multiplication symbol

Proposed Response
- PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Comment ID 4247
What is the purpose of "(DS_FEC_Pld_Sz + DS_FEC_Prty_Sz)" statement?

Suggested Remedy
- Remove, FEC codeword is defined elsewhere (not in Clause 103)

Proposed Response
- PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
- Change "(DS_FEC_Pld_Sz + DS_FEC_Prty_Sz)" to "and is equal to the sum of DS_FEC_Pld_Sz and DS_FEC_Prty_Sz."

Comment ID 4248
No changes to time_quantum as defined in 64.2.2.1

Suggested Remedy
- Change "This constant is defined in 64.2.2.1 and is 16 ns."

Proposed Response
- PROPOSED REJECT.
- "This was discussed in the TF and it was agreed that, for variables defined in CI 64.77 we would reference the normative definition and provide an informative (no "shall") explanation to avoid making the reader swap back and forth between sections of the standard (something the commenter has indicated is an egregious behavior).

The TF can certainly reconsider this position during this comment round (even though this comment is clearly out of scope for this comment round).
Proposed Responses

### Comment 4249

**Comment Type:** E  
**Comment Status:** ez

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

**Suggested Remedy:**
Per comment

**Proposed Response**

W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

### Comment 4250

**Comment Type:** ER

*Why do we need an alias to a constant?*

**Suggested Remedy:**
rather than create a reference mayhem, consider shortening the name of constant and use it directly and not create two redirection levels. That is harder to read.

Remove fecCwSz and fecPldSz, consider shortening names of respective constants and making them more user friendly

**Proposed Response**

W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Now that DS_FEC_CW_SZ_FRAC's alias, fecCwSz, is only use in pseudo code we can remove this alias and replace all instances of it with DS_FEC_CW_SZ_FRAC.

### Comment 4251

**Comment Type:** E

*"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**

W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

### Comment 4252

**Comment Type:** E

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**

W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Use Arial

### Comment 4253

**Comment Type:** ER

Dead link: "see Equation 101-31"

**Suggested Remedy:**
Please provide correct reference where the said variable is defined

**Proposed Response**

W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

s/b Eq 101-32

### Comment 4254

**Comment Type:** TR

RB_time_quanta is NOT defined in Equation 101-31

**Suggested Remedy:**
Please provide correct reference where the said variable is defined

**Proposed Response**

W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

s/b Eq 101-32
Proposed Response #4255

Cl 103 SC 103.3.5.1 P 320 L 41 # 4255
Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks

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

SuggestedRemedy
Consider changing larger hex values to 0xaa-bb-cc-dd 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

Proposed Response #4256

Cl 103 SC 103.3.6.1 P 328 L 10 # 4256
Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks

Comment Type TR Comment Status D
"The Sync Time and Discovery Information fields described in 77.3.6.1 are not used in EPoC and are always set to zero on transmit and ignored on reception." - if that is always set to zero, this should be either a requirement (if setting it to another value breaks anything) or not (then convert it just to statement, without the use of -always-)

SuggestedRemedy
Depending on implementation, setting these fields into non-zero values might imply something to CLT, suggest to convert "are always set" to "shall be set"
Similar change in 103.3.6.3 for REGISTER_REQ description

Proposed Response Response Status W
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Per comment add PICS statement.

Proposed Response #4257

Cl 103 SC 103.3.6 P 328 L 1 # 4257
Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks

Comment Type TR Comment Status D
If there are no changes, all text in lines 3 and 4 is irrelevant.

SuggestedRemedy
Replace "MPCPDU structure and encoding in EPoC is as described in 77.3.6.4 with the exceptions noted below. The MPCPDU structure shall be as shown in Figure 77–31." with "See 77.3.6.4."

Proposed Response Response Status W
PROPOSED REJECT.
There are changes as described in 103.3.6.1 which falls under the "with the exceptions noted below" clause.

Proposed Response #4258

Cl 103 SC 103.3.6.2 P 328 L 12 # 4258
Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks

Comment Type TR Comment Status D
If there are no changes, all text in lines 14/15 is irrelevant. Also, is there any reason to reference Clause 64 here???

SuggestedRemedy
Change "The REPORT MPCPDU used in EPoC is the same as that described in 77.3.6.2 (see 64.3.6.1)." to "See 77.3.6.2."
Similar changes also to 103.3.6.5

Proposed Response Response Status W
PROPOSED REJECT.
We are not so short of bits (or ink) that we are technically prohibited from being kind to the reader.

Proposed Response #4259

Cl 103 SC 103.3.6.3 P 329 L 1 # 4259
Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks

Comment Type T Comment Status D
Unnecessary Figure 103–26 - it is not referenced in the text anyway.

SuggestedRemedy
Remove Figure 103–26

Proposed Response Response Status W
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
On pg 328 line 19 change
"The REGISTER_REQ MPCPDU used in EPoC ..." to
"The REGISTER_REQ MPCPDU used in EPoC and illustrated in Figure 103-26 ..."

See comment #4312

Proposed Response #4260

Cl 103 SC 103.3.6.4 P 330 L 13 # 4260
Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks

Comment Type TR Comment Status D
If there are no changes, all text in lines 14/15 is irrelevant.

SuggestedRemedy
Change "The REPORT MPCPDU used in EPoC is the same as that described in 77.3.6.2 (see 64.3.6.1)." to "See 77.3.6.2."
Similar changes also to 103.3.6.5

Proposed Response Response Status W
PROPOSED REJECT.
We are not so short of bits (or ink) that we are technically prohibited from being kind to the reader.

Proposed Response #4261

Cl 103 SC 103.3.6.5 P 330 L 14 # 4261
Hajduczenia, Marek Bright House Networks

Comment Type TR Comment Status D
If there are no changes, all text in lines 14/15 is irrelevant.

SuggestedRemedy
Change "The REPORT MPCPDU used in EPoC is the same as that described in 77.3.6.2 (see 64.3.6.1)." to "See 77.3.6.2."
Similar changes also to 103.3.6.5

Proposed Response Response Status W
PROPOSED REJECT.
We are not so short of bits (or ink) that we are technically prohibited from being kind to the reader.
Draft 2.1  IEEE 802.3bn EPON Protocol over Coax (EPoC) TF 1st Working Group recirculation ballot comments  Proposed Responses

<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>Response Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>103.3.6.4</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4260</td>
<td>TR</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hajduczewski, Marek</td>
<td>Bright House Networks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment Type TR  Comment Status D  discussed, OOS
Irrelevant information as far as the MPCPDU structure is concerned: "In EPoC the Sync Time field is calculated using rfOnTime, rfOffTime rather than the laserOnTime and laserOffTime used in 77.3.6.4" - this should be clear from calculations in individual SDs, based on which content of individual MPCPDU is filled in.

SuggestedRemedy
Replace text in lines 41-43 with "See 77.3.6.4."
Remove Figure 103–27

Proposed Response  Response Status W  PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Comment Type TR  Comment Status D  discussed, OOS

Cl 45  SC 45.2.1.4  P 29  L 20  # 4261
Marris, Arthur  Cadence Design Syste

Comment Type E  Comment Status D  discussed, OOS
45.2.1.4.b should be inserted after 45.2.1.4.a

SuggestedRemedy
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.

<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>Response Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>100.2.11</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4263</td>
<td>TR</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Laubach, Mark</td>
<td>Broadcom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment Type T  Comment Status D  discussed, OOS
Look at RX_MER vs RX_MER_SC(n) and see if these can be made the same.

SuggestedRemedy
Replace RX_MER with <ital>RX_MER(n)</ital> where appropriate.

Proposed Response  Response Status W  PROPOSED REJECT.
Commenter may withdraw during comment resolution

<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>Response Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>00</td>
<td>100.3.4</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4264</td>
<td>TR</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Laubach, Mark</td>
<td>Broadcom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment Type T  Comment Status D  discussed, OOS
There are 10 occurrences of "OFDM Symbol Clock" in the draft. Can these now be safely changed to "OFDM Clock"?

SuggestedRemedy
Page 110, Line 29: change
Page 110, Line 51: change
Page 161, Line 47: change
Page 162, Line 24: change
Page 162, Line 26: change and add "frequency"
Page 162, Line 29: change
Page 162, Line 32: change
Page 162, Line 42: change
Page 162, Line 52: change and add "frequency"
Page 190, Line 11: change

Proposed Response  Response Status W  PROPOSED ACCEPT.
Changed to Cl 00

Comment ID 4264  Page 16 of 28  11/5/2015 12:43:32 PM
SORT ORDER: Comment ID
IEEE 802.3bn EPON Protocol over Coax (EPoC) TF 1st Working Group recirculation ballot comments

Proposed Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CI</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100A</td>
<td>100A.2</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laubach, Mark</td>
<td>Broadcom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment Type: ER**  **Comment Status: D**

Fix case and TLA problems in table notes for Table 100A-1.

**Suggested Remedy**
- Line 9, NOTE 4: lower case "Frequency"
- Line 12, NOTE 7: lower case words "Reference, Live Video" and "Interference"
- Line 14, NOTE 8: lower case words "Worst Case Frequency; Good" and "Analog", expand "PAR" to "peak-to-average ratio (PAR)"
- Line 17 and 18, NOTE 10: lower case "Bandwidth" and "Levels"
- Line 18, NOTE 10: "ReDesign" comes up in searching for "ReDesign channel model" 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 what this means.)
- Line 20, NOTE 11: lower case "Clipping"
- Line 21, NOTE 12: lower case "Minimum"
- Line 22, NOTE 13: lower case "Single Dominant" and "Does"
- Line 23, NOTE 14: lower case "Definition, Echo"
- Line 24, NOTE 15: lower case "Basis"

**Proposed Response: Response Status: W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CI</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100A</td>
<td>100A.3</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laubach, Mark</td>
<td>Broadcom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment Type: ER**  **Comment Status: D**

Fix case and TLA problems in table notes for Table 100A-2.

**Suggested Remedy**
- Line 10, NOTE 1: lower case "Loss"
- Line 12, NOTE 3: change "DS" to "downstream"
- Line 14, NOTE 4: lower case "Report"
- Line 17, NOTE 6: lower case "Upstream"
- Line 18, NOTE 7: lower case "Single Dominant"
- Line 19, NOTE 8: lower case "Definition, Echo"

**Proposed Response: Response Status: W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CI</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100A</td>
<td>100A.1</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laubach, Mark</td>
<td>Broadcom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Strengthen the relationship of the topology to the baseline channel conditions.

**Suggested Remedy**
- Change: "The normative EPoC OFDM channel parameters are based on the topology shown in Figure 100A-1/" to "The normative EPoC baseline channel conditions and OFDM channel parameters are referenced to the topology shown in Figure 100A-1/"

**Proposed Response: Response Status: W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CI</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100A</td>
<td>100A.3</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laubach, Mark</td>
<td>Broadcom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Reword as only one upstream OFDMA channel

**Suggested Remedy**
- Delete "in a specified OFDMA channel "

**Proposed Response: Response Status: W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Mistype, comment is regarding Page 108, Line 42. Otherwise, as per comment.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>Comment Type</th>
<th>Comment Status</th>
<th>Proposed Response</th>
<th>Response Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4270</td>
<td>ER</td>
<td>30.3.5.1.2</td>
<td>ER</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Add cross references for Clause 103 to two places in Clause 30.</td>
<td>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4271</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>101.4.6.1</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Change &quot;upstream Subcarrier Clock&quot; to &quot;the upstream Subcarrier Clock frequency&quot;</td>
<td>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4272</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>100.3.4</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>4273</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>101.3.2.5.4</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Wording can be clarified on Steps 2 &amp; 4</td>
<td>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CI</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>Proposed Responses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 101 | 101.3.2.1.5 | 131 | 33 | 4275 | Remein, Duane  
Huawei Technologies  

**Comment Type**: E  
**Comment Status**: D  
**Comment**: Figure title should include "state diagram" in the following figures:  
- Figure 101-6  
- Figure 101-7  
- Figure 101-12  
- Figure 101-13  
- Figure 101-15  
- Figure 101-16  
**Suggested Remedy**: Add per comment  
**Proposed Response**: 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>
</table>
| 00  | 0   | 47 | 8  | 4277 | Remein, Duane  
Huawei Technologies  

**Comment Type**: E  
**Comment Status**: D  
**Comment**: EPoC Message Block or EPoC message block? We use both.  
**Suggested Remedy**: Use EPoC message block  
**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>
</table>
| 103 | 103.2.2.7 | 304 | 22 | 4278 | Remein, Duane  
Huawei Technologies  

**Comment Type**: E  
**Comment Status**: D  
**Comment**: In Figure 103–9 transmitProgress[j] = FALSE crosses a line  
**Suggested Remedy**: Nudged left  
**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>
</table>
| 01  | 1.4 | 21 | 24 | 4279 | Remein, Duane  
Huawei Technologies  

**Comment Type**: E  
**Comment Status**: D  
**Comment**: From 802.3 2015  
"1.4.400 time_quantum: The unit of measurement for time related parameters specified in Multipoint MAC Control.  
NOTE—See Clause 64 and Clause 77. The value of time_quantum is defined in 64.2.2.1."  
**Suggested Remedy**: Add Editing instruction for 1.4.400 using proper change markings follows  
"Change the note in 1.4.400 as follows  
NOTE—See Clause 64, and Clause 77, and Clause 103. The value of time_quantum is defined in 64.2.2.1."

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

**Comment ID: 4280**

Remain, Duane  
Huawei Technologies

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

Update Template per V2.5
Changes between Version 2.4 and Version 2.5
- base year variable changed from 201x to 2015
- note regarding the number of levels in the table of contents added
- "A full duplex MAC protocol was added in 1997," added to the Introduction section in front matter.

**Suggested Remedy:**
Per comment

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

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Comment ID: 4281**

Remain, Duane  
Huawei Technologies

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

Subclause numbering in Clause 45 will need to be adjusted depending on publication order of drafts in process.

**Suggested Remedy:**
Add the following Editor's note before Editing instruction for 45.2.1.131:
"Editor's Note (to be removed prior to publication): The Clause numbering in Clause 45 will need to be updated once the publication order of the various amendments is determined."

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

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Comment ID: 4282**

Remain, Duane  
Huawei Technologies

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

missing space in "Clause 31 and"

**Suggested Remedy:**
changed to "Clause 31 and"

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

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Comment ID: 4283**

Remain, Duane  
Huawei Technologies

**Comment Type:** ER

We refer to the variable here as "DS_FreqCh1" without parenthesis. However in 100.2.7.3 where it is defined it is "DS_FreqCh(#)"

**Suggested Remedy:**
Change all instances of "DS_FreqCh1" to "DS_FreqCh(#)" where "#" is any single character 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 or n.

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

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Comment ID: 4284**

Remain, Duane  
Huawei Technologies

**Comment Type:** T

In D2.1 we replaced "BurstTimeHeader()" with "BurstTimeHeaderC()" which was incorrect.

**Suggested Remedy:**
Replace "BurstTimeHeaderC()" with "BurstTimeHeader() (see 101.3.2.5.7)"

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

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Comment ID: 4285**

Remain, Duane  
Huawei Technologies

**Comment Type:** T

What does this mean "This variable represents octet transmission times in 128 time_quantum."

**Suggested Remedy:**
Change definition to read:
"This variable represents 128 time_quantum in octet transmission times."  
Change to:
"This variable represents 128 time_quantum in octet transmission times."

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

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Change to:
"This variable represents the number of octets that can be transmitted in 128 time_quantum. (2048 ns)."

**Comment ID: 4285**
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Proposed Responses

### Comment ID 4286

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

Definition of effectiveLengthC is overly complex:
This variable is used for temporary storage of a normalized net time value. It holds the net effective length of a grant normalized for elapsed time, and compensated for the periods required to turn the RF on and off, and waiting for receiver lock.

Note that RF On/Off time is always 0 as is receiver lock time.

**Suggested Remedy**

Change to:
*This variable is used for temporary storage of a normalized net time value. It holds the net effective length of a grant normalized for elapsed time.*

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

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

### Comment ID 4287

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

This wording
"When read as zero this bit indicates no copy is to be initiated."
should match the formal definition in 101.4.1.2
"This variable is set to FALSE by the PHY on or before completion of the profile copy."

Similar issue in 45.2.1.137.5

**Suggested Remedy**

In 45.2.1.137.2 change:
"When read as zero this bit indicates no copy is to be initiated."
To:
"This bit is set to zero by the PMA/PMD on or before completion of the profile copy."

In 45.2.1.137.5 change:
"When read as zero this bit indicates no copy is to be initiated."
To:
"This bit is set to zero by the PMA/PMD on or before completion of the profile copy."

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

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

### Comment ID 4288

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

Definition of DS_CpyInP & DS_CpyInP don't indicate when set to FALSE.

**Suggested Remedy**

Add to each definition
*"This variable is set to FALSE by the PMA/PMD when the copy is completed."*

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

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

### Comment ID 4289

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

Shouldn't 204 MHz be 204.8 MHz?

**Suggested Remedy**

Change to 204.8 MHz

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

PROPOSED ACCEPT.
### Proposed Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CI</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Comment Type</th>
<th>Comment Status</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Proposed Response</th>
<th>Response Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 01 | 1.4.134 | 4290 | T | D | Align definition of channel with modifications being made in P802.3by (see http://www.ieee802.org/3/by/public/comments/comment #104) "With editorial licence to coordinate with other 802.3 editors... Change from 802.3by
1.4.134 channel: In 10BROAD36, a band of frequencies dedicated to a certain service transmitted on the broadband medium (see IEEE Std 802.3, Clause 11). Otherwise, a defined path along which data in the form of an electrical or optical signal passes."
*Proposed Remedy*

- Change the definition of 1.4.134 as follows:
  1.4.134 channel: In 10BROAD36 and 10GPASS-XR, a band of frequencies dedicated to a certain service transmitted on the broadband medium. (See IEEE Std 802.3, Clause 11, Clause 100, and Clause 101.)

  To:
  "Change the definition of 1.4.134 as modified by P802.3by as follows:
  1.4.134 channel: In 10BROAD36 >>_and 10GPASS-XR,<< a band of frequencies dedicated to a certain service transmitted on the broadband medium. Otherwise, a defined path along which data in the form of an electrical or optical signal passes. (For 10BROAD36 >>_and 10GPASS-XR,<< see IEEE Std 802.3, Clause 11>>_, Clause 100, and Clause 101)>_."

  Where >>_xyz_< is underlined text "xyz"

  Proposed Response: PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

  Change to:
  "Change 1.4.134 as modified by P802.3by as follows:
  1.4.134 channel: In 10BROAD36 >_and EPoC_< a band of frequencies dedicated to a certain service transmitted on the broadband medium. Otherwise, a defined path along which data in the form of an electrical or optical signal passes. (For 10BROAD36, see IEEE Std 802.3, Clause 11>, for EPoC see Clause 100, Clause 101, and Clause 102<)."

  Where >_xyz_< is underlined text.

  Editor is given license to coordinate with P802.3by editor for final text.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CI</th>
<th>102</th>
<th>102.3.5.3</th>
<th>4291</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>US_PhyLinkMod</th>
<th>TYPE: 4 bit integer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>But this is not an integer but a 4-bit binary enumeration.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Proposed Response: PROPOSED ACCEPT*
Comment Type: TR

Comment Status: D

We need a variable and register to identify which OFDM channel profile is to be copied.

Proposed Remedy

In Table 101-1 Add new row
"DS copy channel ID | Profile control | 1.1910.6:4 | DS_CpyCh10 | 6:4"

In 101.4.1.1. pg 159 line 24 change:
"This is controlled via the DS_PrflCpy and US_PrflCpy variables," to
"This is controlled via the DS_PrflCpy, DS_CpyCh and, US_PrflCpy variables.

Create variable in 101.4.1.1.2 as follows:
"DS_CpyCh
TYPE: 3-bit unsigned integer
This variable identifies which of the 5 downstream OFDM channel profiles (profile 1 to 5) is to be copied into the downstream profile variables."

Create new register entry as follows:
In Table 45-98g add:
"1.1910.6:4 | DS copy channel ID | Indicates which of the 5 downstream OFDM channel profiles is to be copied."

Change "1.1910.7:4" to "1.1910.7"

Add new section 45.2.1.137.3:
*45.2.1.137.4 DS copy channel ID (1.1910.6:4)
Bits 1.1910.6:4 indicate which one of the five downstream ODFM channel profiles is to be copied. These bits are a reflection of the >>DS_CpyCh<< variable defined in 101.4.1.1.1."

Proposed Response: PROPOSED ACCEPT.
**Proposed Responses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Comment Status</th>
<th>Response Status</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Proposed Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4294</td>
<td>TR</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Remein, Duane</td>
<td>Change statement to include Link-down condition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4295</td>
<td>TR</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Remein, Duane</td>
<td>Open Table 31A–1, add listings for Cl 103.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4296</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Remein, Duane</td>
<td>Use paragraph tag VariableList per current template.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4297</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Anslow, Pete</td>
<td>Change wording to improve clarity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment Type: TR/technical required; E/editorial required; G/general required.**

**Response Status: O/open, W/written, C/closed, U/unsatisfied, Z/withdrawn.**

**Type: Comment ID 4297 Page 24 of 28 11/5/2015 12:43:33 PM**

**Sort Order: Comment ID**
IEEE 802.3bn EPON Protocol over Coax (EPoC) TF 1st Working Group recirculation ballot comments

Proposed Responses

Comment ID 4298

Cl 01 SC 1.4.294b P 21 L 1
Anslow, Pete Ciena
Comment Type E Comment Status D ez
* "A optical" should be "An optical"
* "fiber optical" does not occur in 802.3 whereas "fiber optic" occurs 438 times

SuggestedRemedy
Change "A optical" to "An optical"
Change "fiber optical" to "fiber optic"

Proposed Response Response Status W
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Comment ID 4299

Cl 01 SC 1.4.331 P 21 L 10
Anslow, Pete Ciena
Comment Type E Comment Status D ez
Deleting the definition in 1.4.331 and re-numbering will change the definition numbering from that point onwards for all subsequent amendments as well as the numbering for this draft. Since P2MP occurs 132 times within 802.3 it seems reasonable to have some explanation of the term in addition to the simple expansion in 1.5.

SuggestedRemedy
If there is an issue with the definition of P2MP network, then change the definition to be just for P2MP.
If the definition has to be deleted, then the numbering of subsequent definitions in the draft have to be changed.
See IEEE Std 802.3bk-2013 (which deleted 1.4.27) for an example of this painful process.
The editing instruction: "Insert the following definitions after 1.4.345 "Q" as follows:" would become: "Insert the following definitions after 1.4.344 "Q" (renumbered from 1.4.345 by the deletion of 1.4.331) as follows:" etc.

Proposed Response Response Status W
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Remove the removal of 1.4.331

Comment ID 4300

Cl 30 SC 30.3.2.1.2 P 23 L 15
Anslow, Pete Ciena
Comment Type E Comment Status D ez
* "Clause 101" should be a cross-reference here and on line 27

SuggestedRemedy
Make "Clause 101" a cross-reference here and on line 27

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

### Proposed Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CI</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>100.2.12</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawe, Piers</td>
<td>Mellanox</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment Type** E  **Comment Status** EZ

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.

**SuggestedRemedy**

Put 100.2.11 under 100.2.10.

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

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CI</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>100.2.5</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawe, Piers</td>
<td>Mellanox</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

There is much more stuff than usual in the "functional specification".

**SuggestedRemedy**

Finish 100.2 PMD functional specification with 100.2.4 PMD transmit enable function then start a new subclause.

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

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CI</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>100.2.10.2</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawe, Piers</td>
<td>Mellanox</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Was resolution to TR comment 4171 implemented? I see that the resolution to T comment 3910 deletes the fix made by the resolution to 4171, which says change to "This section describes the conditions at which the PMD, PMA, PCS in conjunction are required to meet this error ratio".

**SuggestedRemedy**

Insert "This section describes the conditions at which the PMD, PMA, PCS in conjunction are required to meet this frame loss ratio", or better, "This section describes the conditions at which the CLT PMD when connected to a compliant PMA and PCS is required to meet this frame loss ratio", and change subclause title to "CLT receiver error ratio performance in AWGN channel". Similarly for CNU receiver.

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

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

1) Select the "or better" and insert as the first sentence of paragraph on Page 101, Line 17. "This section describes the conditions at which the CLT PMD when connected to a compliant PMA and PCS is required to meet this frame loss ratio." Do similar for Page 104 Line 5.

2) Comment 3883 against D2.0 changed the title of 100.2.12.2 to "CNU error performance in AWGN channel" to remove the word "rate". Suggest doing the same for title of 10.2.10.2 and removing "ratio" to be consistent.
Draft 2.1

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

Proposed Responses

Comment ID 4308

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CI</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>P 100</th>
<th>L 21</th>
<th># 4308</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>100.2.10.2</td>
<td>Piers</td>
<td>Mellanox</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment Type TR

Comment Status D

Discussed

Was resolution to TR comment 4167 implemented? I see that the resolution to T comment 3910 deletes the fix made by the resolution to 4167.

Suggested Remedy

Change "post-FEC frame loss ratio of 10-6 with 1500 byte MAC packets" to "less than or equal to 10-6 frame loss ratio both with 64-byte and 2000-byte Ethernet frames". Similarly in 100.2.12.2.

Also, revise "Large bursts consisting of several 1500 byte MAC packets," in each list to agree - or put the "both 64-byte and 2000-byte Ethernet frames" in the lists only.

Be consistent with base document: MAC packets or Ethernet frames?

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Thanks for catching this, it looks like 3910 interfered with the AIP from comment 4167.

Change: update draft as per remedy. Use "MAC packet".

Comment ID 4309

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CI</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>P 106</th>
<th>L 1</th>
<th># 4310</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>100.2</td>
<td>Piers</td>
<td>Mellanox</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment Type TR

Comment Status D

Discussed

This is still very indirect as a requirement on the PMD. Compare: 95.1.1 Bit error ratio

The bit error ratio (BER) shall be less than 5 x 10-5 provided that the error statistics are sufficiently random that this results in a frame loss ratio (see 1.4.223) of less than 6.2 x 10-10 for 64-octet frames with minimum interpacket gap when processed according to Clause 91.

If the error statistics are not sufficiently random to meet this requirement, then the BER shall be less than that required to give a frame loss ratio of less than 6.2 x 10-10 for 64-octet frames with minimum interpacket gap when processed according to Clause 91.

Suggested Remedy

Please add some guidance as to what the PMD itself is expected to do, e.g. an error ratio for the OFDM/OFDMA time domain samples at the PMA service interface. Even if this is qualified (e.g. "sufficiently random") as above it would still give the reader a starting point.

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Need to ask the PHY experts.

Comment ID 4310

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CI</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>P 106</th>
<th>L 1</th>
<th># 4310</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>101.4</td>
<td>Piers</td>
<td>Mellanox</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment Type E

Comment Status D

Discussed

Figure 100-4 has some odd shading going on in the squares and circles.

Suggested Remedy

Redraw figure to remove shading. It looks like the drawing might be non-Frame; if so suggest redrawing it in Frame.

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Redraw the figure in Frame, remove shading.

Comment ID 4311

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CI</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>P 214</th>
<th>L 11</th>
<th># 4311</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>103.3</td>
<td>Piers</td>
<td>Mellanox</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment Type E

Comment Status D

Discussed

Figure 101-40—BPSK has black squares—are these supposed to be dots? Same for 101-41, 101-42, 101-43.

Suggested Remedy

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See remem_3bn_10_1115 and comments #4232 and #4276

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #4259 (adding ref).

Comment ID 4312

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CI</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>P 329</th>
<th>L 36</th>
<th># 4312</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>103.3</td>
<td>Piers</td>
<td>Mellanox</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment Type E

Comment Status D

Discussed

Figure 103-26—REGISTER_REQ MPCPDU is not referenced in the test.

Suggested Remedy

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Figure 103-26—REGISTER_REQ MPCPDU is not referenced in the test.

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See comment #4259 (adding ref).
Proposed Response

4313

Comment ID: 4313

Carlson, Steve
High Speed Design, Inc.

Comment Type: E
Comment Status: D

In Table 45–98r— and Table 43-98q "formatted" is incorrect.

Suggested Remedy

Change "formatted" to "formatted" in both tables.

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

4314

Comment ID: 4314

Carlson, Steve
High Speed Design, Inc.

Comment Type: ER
Comment Status: D

Line 30 uses log (sub)10, yet line 42 uses log10. Are these supposed to be the same?

Suggested Remedy

Please clarify if line 42 is intended to be log (sub) 10.

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

4315

Comment ID: 4315

Carlson, Steve
High Speed Design, Inc.

Comment Type: TR
Comment Status: D

The text states:

"Bits 1.1920.15:0 are reserved in the event the MAC address is expanded to 64 bits in the future."

It is not appropriate to suggest a future use for register bits. They should simply be marked as "reserved."

Suggested Remedy

Remove 45.2.1.142.3

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

4316

Comment ID: 4316

Carlson, Steve
High Speed Design, Inc.

Comment Type: TR
Comment Status: D

Footnote text states:

"b Nonetheless, it is expected that the CNU would be able to achieve downstream acquisition in less than 30 seconds."

Suggested Remedy

The purpose of this footnote is unclear. The requirement from Table 101–7—Downstream time and frequency synchronization is shown as:

Acquisition Time < 60 seconds b.

Which is it, 30 or 60 seconds? If the requirement is 60, but the note states that 30 seconds is the real number, why not say that? Otherwise, the note simply adds confusion.

Remedy: Delete footnote b, or change the value to 30 in Table 101-7.

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See Comment #4222

Comment ID: 4316