

Proposed Responses

IEEE P802.3ca D1.3 25/50G-EPON Task Force 4th Task Force review comments

**Cl FM SC FM P1 L28 # 2**  
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communicatio  
**Comment Type ER Comment Status D bucket**  
 With IEEE Std 802.3-2018 now published, need to update the frontmatter accordingly  
**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Apply a new FM template (use P802\_3xx\_D0p1\_version\_3p4), accounting for new IEEE Std 802.3-2018 baseline document, with new list of sections, and amendments  
**Proposed Response Response Status W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Cl 1 SC 1.4.90b P20 L41 # 130**  
 Powell, Bill Nokia  
**Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket**  
 sentence: ... in downstream direction  
**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Rewrite: ... in the downstream direction  
**Proposed Response Response Status W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Cl 1 SC 1.4.90b P20 L41 # 131**  
 Powell, Bill Nokia  
**Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket**  
 sentence: ... in upstream direction  
**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Rewrite: ... in the upstream direction  
**Proposed Response Response Status W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Cl 1 SC 1.4.244a P21 L11 # 176**  
 Remein, Duane Huawei  
**Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket**  
 Missing "the" in "In Multi-Channel Reconciliation Sublayer"  
**SuggestedRemedy**  
 change to "In the Multi-Channel Reconciliation Sublayer"  
**Proposed Response Response Status W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Cl 1 SC 1.4.244b P21 L15 # 177**  
 Remein, Duane Huawei  
**Comment Type T Comment Status D bucket**  
 Actually Cl 143 never mentions the term envelope allocation.  
**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Change "In Clause 143" to "In Nx25G-EPON"  
**Proposed Response Response Status W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Cl 1 SC 1.4.244c P21 L20 # 178**  
 Remein, Duane Huawei  
**Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket**  
 Most everywhere else in the draft we use "envelope descriptor" (no caps)  
**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Change all instances of "Envelope Descriptor" to "envelope descriptor"  
**Proposed Response Response Status W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Cl 1 SC 1.4.244d P21 L23 # 179**  
 Remein, Duane Huawei  
**Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket**  
 Most everywhere else in the draft we use "envelope start header" and envelope continuation header (no caps)  
**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Change all to lower case  
**Proposed Response Response Status W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Cl 1 SC 1.4.278 P20 L22 # 125**  
 Powell, Bill Nokia  
**Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket**  
 sentence: There is one-to-one correspondence ...  
**SuggestedRemedy**  
 Rewrite: There is a one-to-one correspondence ...  
**Proposed Response Response Status W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Proposed Responses

IEEE P802.3ca D1.3 25/50G-EPON Task Force 4th Task Force review comments

Cl 1 SC 1.4.313 P20 L29 # 175  
 Remein, Duane Huawei  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket  
 Why do we find it necessary to change "Point-to-Point Emulation sublayer" to "point-to-point emulation sublayer" given that it has been in the Std since 2004? Isn't this change for changes sake? If this is really something that is necessary than at least fix all other variations of this phrase in the Std.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Remove change.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 1 SC 1.4.313 P20 L29 # 126  
 Powell, Bill Nokia  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket  
 sentence: ... through the point-to-point emulation.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Rewrite: ... through point-to-point emulation.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 Emulation being a countable noun, it does need an article :)

Cl 1 SC 1.4.313 P20 L30 # 127  
 Powell, Bill Nokia  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket  
 sentence: ... where a MAC would observe ...  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Rewrite: ... where the ONU's MAC is to observe ...  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Use "where the ONU MAC is to observe" - use proper markup, since it is a change in the original text of base standard.

Cl 1 SC 1.4.313 P20 L31 # 128  
 Powell, Bill Nokia  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket  
 sentence: ... that refers to Physical ...  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Rewrite: ... that refers to a Physical ...  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 1 SC 1.4.313 P20 L32 # 129  
 Powell, Bill Nokia  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket  
 sentence: ... and Group Link ...  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Rewrite: ... and a Group Link  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 1 SC 1.4.333a P21 L27 # 180  
 Remein, Duane Huawei  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket  
 MCRS has already been introduced (in 1.4.244a)  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change:  
 "a Multi-Channel RS (MCRS)." to "an MCRS."  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 31A SC 31A P23 L13 # 75  
 Kramer, Glen Broadcom  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket  
 No need to capitalize "Discovery Window"  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change to lower case (16 instances) (whatch for start of sentence capitalization)  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Proposed Responses

IEEE P802.3ca D1.3 25/50G-EPON Task Force 4th Task Force review comments

Cl 56 SC 56.1.2 P26 L9 # 181  
 Remein, Duane Huawei  
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D bucket  
 Figure 56-5a is a new figure and should not show any changes  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Remove change markings from the figure.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 141 SC 141.2.5 P37 L47 # 277  
 Law, David HPE  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket  
 There are four instances of 'power budget class' but 13 instances of 'power class' in the draft, I believe that they are in reference to the same item. Looking at Clause 75 I can find instances of 'power budget class' but no instances of 'power class'.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Suggest that only 'power budget class' is used.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 In 141.2.5 change  
 Nx25G-EPON PMDs defined in this clause are defined as one of two power classes  
 to  
 Nx25G-EPON PMDs defined in this clause are defined as one of two power classes (a power class is a differentiator for PMD specifications based of their launch powers and sensitivities)  
 -----  
 In 141.2.7 change  
 The PHY link power budget  
 to  
 The PHY link power budget (a power budget is a characteristic of a link and depends on PMDs in the function transmitter launch power and receiver sensitivity)

Cl 141 SC 141.2.7 P39 L33 # 84  
 Kramer, Glen Broadcom  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket  
 Two instances of "50/50/-PQ" - extra "/" just before hyphen.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Replace "50/50/" with "50/50"  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 141 SC 141.6.1 P50 L15 # 191  
 Remein, Duane Huawei  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket  
 Parameter (1st) column in Table 141-17 looks odd.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change para formatting and ensure these are left justified.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 141 SC 141.6.1 P51 L1 # 102  
 Johnson, John Broadcom  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D bucket  
 Table 141-18 does not display completely in the D1.3 pdf file (has missing rows and missing borders). Table 141-18 should have the same format as Table 141-17.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Reformat Table 141-18 to be the same as 141-17.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Proposed Responses

IEEE P802.3ca D1.3 25/50G-EPON Task Force 4th Task Force review comments

Cl 141 SC 141.6.1 P51 L 16 # 193  
 Remein, Duane Huawei  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket  
 Cell borders are difficult to see in Table 141-18  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Ensure they are turned on and black in color.  
 Also check footnotes, they should be on the same page as the table body (appears to be enough room).  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 141 SC 141.6.1 P51 L 16 # 166  
 Wey, Jun Shan ZTE TX  
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D bucket  
 Table 141-18 has a formatting problem. Entries after "TDP, each channel (max)" are missing  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Restore the table  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 141 SC 141.7.14.1 P58 L 31 # 199  
 Remein, Duane Huawei  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket  
 Stray paren "jitter"  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Strike the errant parenthesis.  
 While here fix the "Figure <TBD>" which should be "(Figure 141-3)"  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 141 SC 141.7.14.1 P58 L 38 # 200  
 Remein, Duane Huawei  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket  
 I believe Fig 141-3 and 141-5 fulfill the Ed Note  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Strike the Editor's Note.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 142 SC 142.1.3 P65 L 44 # 202  
 Remein, Duane Huawei  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket  
 We equate SP to "Synchronization Pattern" but are then very inconsistent in using this abbreviation (20 instances of "Synchronization Pattern", 25 of "SP")  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Replace all instances of "synchronization pattern" (case insensitive) with "SP" except in clause titles and first use in a clause.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Use non-subscripted version of SP1, SP2, and SP3

Cl 142 SC 142.1.3 P65 L 47 # 10  
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communicatio  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket  
 Formatting consistency: SP1, SP2, SP3  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Make sure that 1, 2, 3 is in subscript - apply changes consistently to Clause 142 and 144  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Proposed Responses

IEEE P802.3ca D1.3 25/50G-EPON Task Force 4th Task Force review comments

CI 142 SC 142.1.3 P65 L48 # 73  
 Kramer, Glen Broadcom

Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket

Inconsistent terminology:

- "Start of Burst Delimiter (SBD)" - used twice
- "start-of-burst delimiter (SBD)" - used once
- "End of Burst Delimiter (EBD)" - used once
- "end of burst delimiter" - used twice
- "end-of-burts delimiter (EBD)" - used once

SuggestedRemedy

In all places use "start-of-burst delimiter (SBD)" and "end-of-burst delimiter (EBD)"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 142 SC 142.1.3 P67 L1 # 11  
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communicatio

Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket

Make sure Figure 142-2 has all instances of "process" capitalized, per comment #452 against D1.2

SuggestedRemedy

Per comment

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 142 SC 142.1.3 P67 L22 # 44  
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communicatio

Comment Type T Comment Status D bucket

Units missing in Figure 142-2: 25.78125 is missing "G"

SuggestedRemedy

Make sure units are shown in Figure 142-2

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 142 SC 142.1.3 P67 L49 # 12  
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communicatio

Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket

Missing reference to Clause 144

SuggestedRemedy

Change "<TBD new subclause with MPCPDU definition>" with "144.3.4.7", make sure the link is live

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 142 SC 142.1.3.1 P68 L21 # 203  
 Remein, Duane Huawei

Comment Type ER Comment Status D bucket

When referring to SP1, SP2, and SP3 the use of number subscripting is very inconsistent.

SuggestedRemedy

Either subscripted or normal font is fine. Using both is not. I would recommend not subscripting to make life easier for the editor.

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Use non-subscripter version consistently.

CI 142 SC 142.2 P69 L30 # 46  
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communicatio

Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket

Missing references marked in red

SuggestedRemedy

- Use the following references:
- Input: 142.2.5.4.1
  - Framer: 142.2.5.4.2
  - Transmit: 142.2.5.4.3
- Make sure that links are live

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Proposed Responses

IEEE P802.3ca D1.3 25/50G-EPON Task Force 4th Task Force review comments

CI 142 SC 142.2.1.1 P69 L49 # 48  
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communicatio  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket  
 There is no need to create a new subclause 142.2.1.1 to separate line codes in any way  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Remove heading 142.2.1.1.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 142 SC 142.2.4.1 P71 L40 # 50  
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communicatio  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket  
 Dead link to "142.2.2.6"  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change to "142.2.5.4.3" and make sure it is live  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 142 SC 142.2.4.1 P71 L5 # 140  
 Powell, Bill Nokia  
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D bucket  
 Current: "The output of FEC Encoder is denoted by ..."  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Add "the" as follows: The output of "the" FEC Encoder is denoted by...  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 142 SC 142.2.4.1 P74 L42 # 51  
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communicatio  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket  
 It does not seem there is a special purpose for capitalizing "Codeword Information/Parity Location"  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Drop capitalization in "Codeword Information/Parity Location"  
 The same applies to Figure 142-7 caption  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 142 SC 142.2.4.1 P71 L6 # 142  
 Powell, Bill Nokia  
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D bucket  
 sentence: ... is length of encoder output sequence  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 rewrite: is the length of the encoder output sequence.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 142 SC 142.2.4.1 P74 L51 # 52  
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communicatio  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket  
 Minor issues with the text of the Note  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 1. Make sure that the text of the note starts with upper case letter.  
 2. Not "Transmitter User Bits" but "Transmitted User Bits" to match Figure 142-7  
 3. Not sure why we need to match capitalization; drop capitalization in Transmitted User Bits and Zero Bits  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

CI 142 SC 142.2.4.1 P71 L6 # 141  
 Powell, Bill Nokia  
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D bucket  
 channel code element u2  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 use subscript: u2  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Proposed Responses

IEEE P802.3ca D1.3 25/50G-EPON Task Force 4th Task Force review comments

Cl 142 SC 142.2.4.5 P77 L 50 # 109  
 Laubach, Mark Broadcom  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket  
 Tables 142-3 and 142-4 have landed right in the middle of the example.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Wish: if there is any way to "keep with next" in Framemaker to keep all the clause text together without interruption from another clauses tables.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
 Editor will wrestle with Frame and make sure the home team wins.

Cl 142 SC 142.2.5 P81 L 9 # 54  
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communicatio  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket  
 We usually say that the bit is equal or set to a specific value: bit 257 is one  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change: "bit 257 is one" to "bit 257 is equal to 1"  
 Change: "bit 257 is zero" to "bit 257 is equal to 0"  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 142 SC 142.2.5.1 P81 L 14 # 74  
 Kramer, Glen Broadcom  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket  
 EBD constant is defined twice. On time it is defined as 258-bit value, the other time it is defined as 257-bit value.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Keep the definition in 142.2.5.1, but replace Value with "0x0-(00)<sub>32</sub>"  
 In EBD definition in 142.3.5.1, just reference 142.2.5.1  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
 Comment is against 142.2.5.1, page: 81, line: 14 (references were fixed)

Cl 142 SC 142.2.5.1 P81 L 16 # 87  
 Kramer, Glen Broadcom  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket  
 In .3ca, we have  
 "msb" - 3 instances  
 "MSB" = 5 instances  
 in 802.3-2018 we have  
 "msb" - 2 instances  
 "MSB" = 130 instances  
 "MSB" wins  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Replace all "msb" with "MSB"  
 Replace all "lsb" with "LSB"  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 142 SC 142.2.5.2 P82 L 28 # 59  
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communicatio  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket  
 Two different ways of saying the same thing, i.e., taking the larger value of the two options.  
 My personal preference is for the first one, given it is simpler to read  
 This FIFO holds either SP\_LENGTH or FEC\_PARITY\_SIZE elements, whichever is greater.  
 The length of the TX\_FIFO[] is defined as: MAX{ FEC\_DELAY - SP\_LENGTH, 2 }  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change  
 The length of the TX\_FIFO[] is defined as: MAX{ FEC\_DELAY - SP\_LENGTH, 2 }  
 to  
 This FIFO holds either (FEC\_DELAY - SP\_LENGTH) or two elements, whichever is greater.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Proposed Responses

IEEE P802.3ca D1.3 25/50G-EPON Task Force 4th Task Force review comments

Cl 142 SC 142.2.5.2 P82 L47 # 57  
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communicatio  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket  
 Anything special about this particular parity to capitalize it? "257-bit Parity vectors"  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change to read "257-bit parity vectors"  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 142 SC 142.2.5.2 P82 L48 # 56  
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communicatio  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket  
 PCS Framer or PCS Framer Process, as called everywhere else?  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change all standalone instances of "PCS Framer" to "PCS Framer Process" - do observe capitalization  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 142 SC 142.2.5.3 P84 L7 # 61  
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communicatio  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket  
 Make sure that PARITY\_STAGING\_BUFFER name is not broken across lines  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Per comment  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 142 SC 142.2.5.3 P84 L34 # 62  
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communicatio  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D bucket  
 There are only two reference to TX\_CLK25 in the whole draft  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change both instances of TX\_CLK25 to TX\_CLK  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 142 SC 142.2.5.4.1 P84 L53 # 63  
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communicatio  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket  
 Reference marked in red is correct  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Remove red background + make reference live  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 142 SC 142.2.5.4.1 P86 L1 # 65  
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communicatio  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket  
 We have very inconsistent way of defining function names: looking at Figure 142-13, we have ENCODE, but Transcode, Scramble, Append, but also FEC\_Encode. I suggest we use a simple notation with no "\_" to combine words  
 Similar inconsistencies appear in variables names: TxNext, TxPrev, but xIndex, XBUFFER  
 We need to adopt some naming scheme and stick to it to avoid confusion: typically, we used all caps for state names and constants; camel case for variable and function names.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change function names as follows:  
 - ENCODE to Encode  
 - FEC\_Encode to EncodeFec  
 Change variable names as follows:  
 - XBUFFER to BufferX  
 - xIndex to IndexX  
 - INPUT\_FIFO to FifoInput  
 - TX\_FIFO to FifoTx  
 Update SDs accordingly. A global update to the draft might be needed if TF believes it is the right time to do such a cleanup.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.



## Proposed Responses

## IEEE P802.3ca D1.3 25/50G-EPON Task Force 4th Task Force review comments

**Cl 142** SC **142.3.4** P**89** L**12** # **25**  
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communicatio  
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **D** bucket  
 No content for Figure 142-17  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Mark the content as TBD  
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Cl 143** SC **143.2.3** P**99** L**40** # **113**  
 Laubach, Mark Broadcom  
 Comment Type **T** Comment Status **D** bucket  
 Here the "m" (lower case) represents the MAC instance. In Figure 143-10 "M" is used (upper case), page 108 line 21.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Suggest changing one or the other to make the references be consistent in case.  
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 There are M channels in total, where m (index of MCRS channel) ranges from 0 to M-1

**Cl 143** SC **143.2.4.3** P**101** L**2** # **114**  
 Laubach, Mark Broadcom  
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **D** bucket  
 This reads like a blank line has been inserted.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Remove the blank line.  
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Cl 143** SC **143.3.2** P**111** L**43** # **206**  
 Remein, Duane Huawei  
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **D** bucket  
 ESH & ECH have already been introduced.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 strike "envelope start header" and parenthesis around ESH.  
 On pg 117 line 52, pg 119 line 14, and pg 122 line 42 change "envelope start header" to "ESH"  
 Strike "envelope continuation header" and parenthesis around "ECH"  
 On pg 117 line 29, pg 119 line 15, and pg 126 line 38 change "envelope continuation header" to "ESH"  
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

**Cl 143** SC **143.3.3.4** P**116** L**22** # **207**  
 Remein, Duane Huawei  
 Comment Type **E** Comment Status **D** bucket  
 of ... of grammar  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 change:  
 "All or some number of lower bits of EnvPam" to:  
 "All or some number of EnvPam lower bits"  
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**  
 PROPOSED REJECT.  
 Text reads fine as it is.

**Cl 144** SC **144.1.1.3** P**136** L**47** # **34**  
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communicatio  
 Comment Type **T** Comment Status **D** bucket  
 "MCRS described in this clause" is wrong - this is MPMC Clause  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change "MCRS described in this clause" to "MPMC described in this clause"  
 Proposed Response Response Status **W**  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Proposed Responses

IEEE P802.3ca D1.3 25/50G-EPON Task Force 4th Task Force review comments

Cl 144 SC 144.2 P140 L 2 # 208  
 Remein, Duane Huawei  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket  
 "opcode specific" or "opcode-specific" we should be consistent  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Use "opcode-specific" consistently.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 144 SC 144.2.1.5 P142 L 14 # 213  
 Remein, Duane Huawei  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D bucket  
 "?" is not a valid SD operator per table 21-5.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change to the symbol for Indicates nonmembership (̄ or ALT-0207 in frame Symbol font).  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 144 SC 144.2.1.5 P142 L 14 # 35  
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communicatio  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket  
 Symbol (does not belong to) did not get mapped correctly (exit out of PARSE\_OPCODE state), when opcode does not belong to the group of supported opcodes  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Fix the symbol (does not belong to)  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 144 SC 144.2.1.5 P142 L 14 # 72  
 Kramer, Glen Broadcom  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D bucket  
 "Not equal" and "Not belong" symbols in several state diagrams got corrupted when converting from Word to FM  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Replace "?" in the following state diagrams:  
 144-5 - replace with "not belong"  
 144-22 - replace with "not equal"  
 144-23 - replace with "not equal"  
 144-25 - replace with "not equal"  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 144 SC 144.3.4 P144 L 53 # 219  
 Remein, Duane Huawei  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket  
 Wording: "the address any of the individual MACs"  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change to "the address of any individual MAC"  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 144 SC 144.3.4 P145 L 4 # 220  
 Remein, Duane Huawei  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket  
 "Table 31A-1" can be a live link.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 per comment  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Proposed Responses

IEEE P802.3ca D1.3 25/50G-EPON Task Force 4th Task Force review comments

Cl 144 SC 144.3.4.4 P150 L35 # 36  
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communicatio  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket  
 Reference marked in red needs to be fixed  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change 143.2.1.1 to 144.3.2.1 and mark the link live  
 Change 143.2.1.2 to 144.3.2.2 and mark the link live  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 144 SC 144.3.4.4 P150 L35 # 226  
 Remein, Duane Huawei  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket  
 Fix the Ref "(see 143.2.1.1)" here and pg 152 line 13  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 144.3.2.1  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 144 SC 144.3.4.4 P150 L37 # 227  
 Remein, Duane Huawei  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket  
 Fix the Ref "(see 143.2.1.2)" here and pg 152 line 15  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 144.3.2.2  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 144 SC 144.3.4.4 P151 L12 # 230  
 Remein, Duane Huawei  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket  
 Wording "and such frame is marked"  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change to "and is marked"  
 Change ref to Table 144-1  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 144 SC 144.3.4.4 P151 L12 # 37  
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communicatio  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket  
 I do not believe this statement is correct anymore: The xxx MPCPDU is generated by a MAC Control instance mapped to all ONUs and such frame is marked by the broadcast LLID (see TBD).  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change to "The xxx MPCPDU is generated by a MAC Control instance mapped to all ONUs and such frame is marked by the broadcast PLID (BCAST\_PLID, see Table 144-1)." make the link live  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 Include comment #230.

Cl 144 SC 144.3.4.6 P152 L48 # 231  
 Remein, Duane Huawei  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket  
 Add xRef to Table 144-2 in Channel Assignment description.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 per comment  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Proposed Responses

IEEE P802.3ca D1.3 25/50G-EPON Task Force 4th Task Force review comments

Cl 144 SC 144.3.4.6 P153 L2 # 232  
 Remein, Duane Huawei  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket  
 Sentence beginning "2 bits" should be "Two bits ..." Add period at end of sentence.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 per comment  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 144 SC 144.3.4.6 P153 L3 # 233  
 Remein, Duane Huawei  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket  
 "This is 16-bit unsigned" should be "This is a 16-bit unsigned"  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 per comment  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 144 SC 144.3.4.6 P153 L9 # 235  
 Remein, Duane Huawei  
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D bucket  
 We are inconsistent in using italics for "Discovery Information".  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Scrub the draft and be consistent (not italics; it is not a variable it is a field).  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.  
 Will do, but a "scrub" is not very helpful on 174 pages of draft that keeps on growing every cycle. Specific locations would be super. Handy

Cl 144 SC 144.3.5 P156 L8 # 38  
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communicatio  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket  
 Missing reference updates in lines 8 and 23  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Replace 77.3.6.1 with 144.3.4.6  
 Replace 77.3.6.3 with 144.3.4.3  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 144 SC 144.3.5 P156 L8 # 267  
 Remein, Duane Huawei  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket  
 Fix xRef. 77.3.6.1  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change to Table 144-7 (included in remein\_3ca\_1\_1118.pdf)  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 See comment #38

Cl 144 SC 144.3.5 P156 L23 # 269  
 Remein, Duane Huawei  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket  
 Fix xRef. 77.3.6.3  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change to Table 144-4.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  
 See comment #38

Proposed Responses

IEEE P802.3ca D1.3 25/50G-EPON Task Force 4th Task Force review comments

Cl 144 SC 144.3.5 P156 L41 # 271  
 Remein, Duane Huawei  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket  
 Most everywhere else these terms are capitalized; laser on time and laser off time  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Capitalize consistently.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 144 SC 144.3.5.2 P160 L46 # 276  
 Remein, Duane Huawei  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket  
 Wording "registration attempt deemed failed due to lack"  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change to "registration attempt is deemed to have failed due to a lack"  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 144 SC 144.3.5 P156 L48 # 272  
 Remein, Duane Huawei  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket  
 Figure 144-30 should be Figure 144-15 and a live xref.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 per comment  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 144 SC 144.3.5.3 P161 L12 # 238  
 Remein, Duane Huawei  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket  
 Indenting should match "// 1)" for "// 2) ... MsgRegisterAck.Flag = Deregister )".  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 per comment  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 144 SC 144.3.5 P156 L49 # 174  
 Wey, Jun Shan ZTE TX  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D bucket  
 "Figure 144-30" should be "Figure 144-15"  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Correct the figure number  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 144 SC 144.3.5.3 P161 L31 # 239  
 Remein, Duane Huawei  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket  
 "trans-mission"?  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 strike the dash  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 144 SC 144.3.5 P158 L4 # 274  
 Remein, Duane Huawei  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket  
 "<TBD reference to clause 143>)." should be 144.3.4.7  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 per comment  
 (included in remein\_3a\_1\_1118.pdf)  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 144 SC 144.3.5.3 P161 L49 # 241  
 Remein, Duane Huawei  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket  
 Wording "in case when" in two places  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 change to: "in the case where"  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Proposed Responses

IEEE P802.3ca D1.3 25/50G-EPON Task Force 4th Task Force review comments

Cl 144 SC 144.3.5.3 P161 L 52 # 42  
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communicatio  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D bucket  
 Referece missing  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Replace 144.2.2.2 with 142.1.3 and make link live  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 144 SC 144.3.5.3 P161 L 52 # 242  
 Remein, Duane Huawei  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket  
 142.2.2.2 should be 142.1.3 and live xRef  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 per comment  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 144 SC 144.3.5.4 P162 L 9 # 43  
 Hajduczenia, Marek Charter Communicatio  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket  
 Wrong (even though correct) capitalization in 256b/257b  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change to 256B/257B  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 144 SC 144.3.5.5 P162 L 24 # 244  
 Remein, Duane Huawei  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket  
 Deep in the details of ONU Discovery & Registration we point to a blank introduction?  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Change "see 144.1.1.3" to "see 144.3.5.8"  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 144 SC 144.3.5.5 P162 L 28 # 245  
 Remein, Duane Huawei  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket  
 "that ONU" should be "that the ONU"  
 "where nth" should be "where the nth" (2x)  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 per comment  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Per comment + use proper formatting for "n<sub>th</sub>"  
 Cl 144 SC 144.3.5.5 P162 L 30 # 71  
 Kramer, Glen Broadcom  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket  
 Lost formatting of "nth" when converting from Word to FM  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Replace "nth" with "n<sup>th</sup>" - 8 occurences in the draft , all in Clause 144.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 144 SC 144.3.5.5 P162 L 36 # 246  
 Remein, Duane Huawei  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket  
 "carried in ..." should be "carried in the ..." (6x on this page)  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 per comment  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Proposed Responses

IEEE P802.3ca D1.3 25/50G-EPON Task Force 4th Task Force review comments

Cl 144 SC 144.3.5.6 P163 L 5 # 248  
 Remein, Duane Huawei  
 Comment Type T Comment Status D bucket  
 "are carries in" should be "are carried in"  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 per comment  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 144 SC 144.3.5.7 P164 L 24 # 250  
 Remein, Duane Huawei  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D bucket  
 Improper exit criteria from VERIFY\_REGISTER\_ACK "MsgRegsiterAck.Flag ? ACK"  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Replace "?" with not equal sign (≠)  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 144 SC 144.3.5.8 P165 L 7 # 251  
 Remein, Duane Huawei  
 Comment Type TR Comment Status D bucket  
 More questionable exit criteria, this time from WAIT\_FOR\_SYNC\_PATTERN  
 "MsgSyncPattern.Index ? SplIndex"  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Replace "?" with not equal sign (≠)  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 144 SC 144.3.5.8 P165 L 22 # 252  
 Remein, Duane Huawei  
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D bucket  
 Why is there a blank line in the middle of COMMIT\_DISC\_ENV?  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 remove the blank line  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 144 SC 144.3.5.8 P165 L 39 # 258  
 Remein, Duane Huawei  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket  
 Searching for "Figure 144–23" does not find the reference to the figure on pg 164 due to a  
 hidden charcter in the ref.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Remove the hidden character so a search on "Figure 144–23" finds both the ref and the  
 figure.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 144 SC 144.3.6.1 P165 L 24 # 256  
 Remein, Duane Huawei  
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D bucket  
 GRANT\_MARGIN not yet defined.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Move definiton including note from 144.3.6.1 to 144.3.5.1. Add xRef to 144.3.6.1.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 144 SC 144.3.6.3 P166 L 41 # 261  
 Remein, Duane Huawei  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket  
 Why "etc"? We only have two channels.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Remove ", etc"  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Proposed Responses

IEEE P802.3ca D1.3 25/50G-EPON Task Force 4th Task Force review comments

Cl 144 SC 144.3.6.5 P167 L41 # 69  
 Kramer, Glen Broadcom  
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D bucket  
 Definition of GateTxTime has a stray new line character and appears as two separate definitions.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Fix to match the formatting in the original contribution kramer\_3ca\_3a\_0918.pdf  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 144 SC 144.3.6.6 P167 L53 # 70  
 Kramer, Glen Broadcom  
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D bucket  
 A set of sub-fields in MsgEnvDescriptor got formatted as if they were definitions of separate independent messages  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Fix to match the formatting in the original contribution kramer\_3ca\_3a\_0918.pdf (indent the sub-fields)  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 144 SC 144.3.6.6 P168 L1 # 264  
 Remein, Duane Huawei  
 Comment Type ER Comment Status D bucket  
 Formatting of the MsgEnvDescriptor parameters is confusing.  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 Indent all parameters (ChIndex, EnvStartTime, EnvCount, EnvLLID[], and EnvLength[]) so it is clear this is part of the MsgEnvDescriptor definition as was done in kramer\_3ca\_3a\_0918.pdf. Skip the newline after each parameter (for example: "ChIndex: a 1-bit integer indicating whether the following envelope descriptors are intended for channel 0 or channel 1. EnvStartTime: 32-bit unsigned ..."  
 Remove blank lines between parameters.  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl Abstrac SC Abstract P3 L3 # 123  
 Powell, Bill Nokia  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket  
 (downstream / upstream)  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 remove spaces: (downstream/upstream)  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl Abstrac SC Abstract P3 L11 # 124  
 Powell, Bill Nokia  
 Comment Type E Comment Status D bucket  
 and for split ratio  
 SuggestedRemedy  
 insert "a": and for a split ratio  
 Proposed Response Response Status W  
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.