

Proposed Responses

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

Cl **FM** SC **FM** P1 L28 # 2 [REDACTED]
 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 [REDACTED]
 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 [REDACTED]
 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 [REDACTED]
 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 [REDACTED]
 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 [REDACTED]
 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 [REDACTED]
 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 [REDACTED]
 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 # 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 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 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 141.5.2 P47 L21 # 163
 Wey, Jun Shan ZTE TX
 Comment Type E Comment Status D informative, bucket
 In Table 141-15, "Receiver sensitivity (OMA), each channel (max)" is informative. Even though this information is mentioned in the footnote, it would be useful to add "Informative" within the table for convinience.
 SuggestedRemedy
 "Receiver sensitivity (OMA), each channel (max) (Informative)"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED REJECT.

Footnote is sufficient. Even though informative parameters were used in .3av, no such markup was used in tables.

Cl 141 SC 141.5.2 P48 L19 # 164
 Wey, Jun Shan ZTE TX
 Comment Type E Comment Status D informative, bucket
 In Table 141-16, "Average receive power, each channel (min)" is informative. Even though this information is mentioned in the footnote, it would be useful to add "Informative" within the table for convinience.
 SuggestedRemedy
 "Average receive power, each channel (min) (Informative)"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED REJECT.
 See comment #163

Proposed Responses

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

Cl 141 SC 141.5.2 P48 L26 # 165
 Wey, Jun Shan ZTE TX
 Comment Type E Comment Status D *informative, bucket*
 In Table 141-16, "Receiver sensitivity (OMA), each channel (max)" is informative. Even though this information is mentioned in the footnote, it would be useful to add "Informative" within the table for convenience.
 SuggestedRemedy
 "Receiver sensitivity (OMA), each channel (max) (Informative)"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED REJECT.
 See comment #163

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.

Cl 141 SC 141.6.1 P51 L16 # 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 141.6.1 P51 L16 # 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 141.6.2 P53 L37 # 167
 Wey, Jun Shan ZTE TX
 Comment Type E Comment Status D *informative, bucket*
 In Table 141-19, "Receiver sensitivity (OMA), each channel (max)" is informative. Even though this information is mentioned in the footnote, it would be useful to add "Informative" within the table for convenience.
 SuggestedRemedy
 "Receiver sensitivity (OMA), each channel (max) (Informative)"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED REJECT.
 See comment #163

Proposed Responses

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

Cl 141 SC 141.6.2 P54 L22 # 168
 Wey, Jun Shan ZTE TX
 Comment Type E Comment Status D informative, bucket
 In Table 141-20, "Average receive power, each channel (min)" is informative. Even though this information is mentioned in the footnote, it would be useful to add "Informative" within the table for convenience.
 SuggestedRemedy
 "Average receive power, each channel (min) (Informative)"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED REJECT.
 See comment #163

Cl 141 SC 141.6.2 P54 L27 # 169
 Wey, Jun Shan ZTE TX
 Comment Type E Comment Status D informative, bucket
 In Table 141-20, "Receiver sensitivity (OMA), each channel (max)" is informative. Even though this information is mentioned in the footnote, it would be useful to add "Informative" within the table for convenience.
 SuggestedRemedy
 "Receiver sensitivity (OMA), each channel (max) (Informative)"
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED REJECT.
 See comment #163

Cl 141 SC 141.7.14.1 P58 L31 # 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 L38 # 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 L44 # 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 L47 # 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 IN PRINCIPLE.
 Use non-subscripted version consistently.

Proposed Responses

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

Cl 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.

Cl 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.

Cl 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.

Cl 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.

Cl 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-subscriber version consistently.

Cl 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

Cl 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.

Cl 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.

Cl 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.

Cl 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.

Cl 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.

Cl 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.

Cl 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.

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 L50 # 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 L9 # 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 L16 # 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 L28 # 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.

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.

Proposed Responses

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

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 IN PRINCIPLE.

Change function names as follows:
 - ENCODE to Encode
 - FEC_Encode to FecEncode

Change variable names as follows:
 - XBUFFER to xBuffer
 - INPUT_FIFO to InputFifo
 - TX_FIFO to TxFifo

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 Responses

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

Cl 142 SC 142.3.4 P89 L12 # 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 P99 L40 # 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 chaneln in total, where m (index of MCRS channel) ranges from 0 to M-1

Cl 143 SC 143.2.4.3 P101 L2 # 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 P111 L43 # 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 144 SC 144.1.1.3 P136 L47 # 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.

Cl 144 SC 144.2 P140 L2 # 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.

Proposed Responses

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

Cl 144 SC 144.2.1.5 P142 L14 # 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 144.2.1.5 P142 L14 # 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 L14 # 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 144.3.4 P144 L53 # 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 L4 # 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.

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 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.

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 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 # 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.

Change to: "The REGISTER MPCPDU uses an individual ONU MAC as the DA and is tagged with discovery PLID (See DISC_PLID in Table 144-1)."
 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 IN PRINCIPLE.
 See comment #37

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.

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.

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 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 IN PRINCIPLE.
 Per comment + field name from Discovery Information to DiscoveryInfo (we agreed to have all field names as single word).
 Target locations as follows (received from Duane): pg/ln 153/9, 156/7
 AI for Glen to make updates to 144.3.4 per offline discussion.

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 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 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 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 144.3.5.2 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 144.3.5.3 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.

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 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 144.3.5.3 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.

Cl 144 SC 144.3.5.3 P161 L52 # 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 L52 # 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 L9 # 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 L24 # 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 L28 # 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_{th}"

Proposed Responses

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

Cl 144 SC 144.3.5.5 P162 L30 # 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 "nth" - 8 occurrences in the draft , all in Clause 144.
 Proposed Response Response Status W
 PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl 144 SC 144.3.5.5 P162 L36 # 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.

Cl 144 SC 144.3.5.6 P163 L5 # 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 L24 # 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 L7 # 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 L22 # 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 L39 # 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 character 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.

Proposed Responses

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

Cl 144 SC 144.3.6.1 P165 L24 # 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 L41 # 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.

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
 Formating 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 defintion 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.

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