

**Question(s):** 2/15

Stockholm, 26-27 June 2008

LIAISON STATEMENT**Source:** ITU-T Study Group 15**Title:** Progress of the work on a 1Gbit/s point-to-point Ethernet-based optical access system**LIAISON STATEMENT****To:** IEEE 802.3 Working group**Approval:** Agreed to at Q2/15 meeting (Stockholm, 26 – 27 June 2008)**For:** Information**Deadline:****Contact:** Frank Effenberger
Huawei Technologies Co.,Ltd.
China
Tel: +1 (908) 670 3889
Email: feffenberger@huawei.com**Contact:** David Faulkner
British Telecom
United Kingdom
Email: dave.faulkner@bt.com**Contact:** Kazutomo Hasegawa
Fujitsu
Japan
Tel: +81-44-813-5175
Fax: +81-44-814-9030
Email: k.hase@jp.fujitsu.com**Contact:** Junichi Kani
NTT
Japan
Tel: +81-43-211-3262
Fax: +81-43-211-8875
Email: kani.junichi@ansl.ntt.co.jp**Contact:** Makoto Kadowaki
NEC
Japan
Tel: +81-3-3798-5392
Fax: +81-3-3798-7266
Email: kadowaki@magnus.nec.co.jp

ITU-T Q2/15 thanks the IEEE 802.3 working group for their kind liaison response to ITU-T SG15 liaison letter LS 203 with showing their understanding on the proposed work on 1-Gbit/s point-to-point Ethernet-based optical access system.

We have decided to proceed with the work at Q2/15, while also respecting each of the three items requested in the liaison response.

We also studied the proposed option, which is to adopt alternative existing specifications from IEEE. As for the physical layer specification, we have agreed to keep the ODN requirement defined

Attention: Some or all of the material attached to this liaison statement may be subject to ITU copyright. In such a case this will be indicated in the individual document. Such a copyright does not prevent the use of the material for its intended purpose, but it prevents the reproduction of all or part of it in a publication without the authorization of ITU.

in ITU-T Recommendation G.985, and we found 1000BASE-PX10 PMD specified in IEEE Std 802.3 Clause 60 defined bigger loss budget than that of Class S in G.985. This bigger loss budget would lead to higher specifications and thus more cost than expected. As for the OAM specification, we found the functions specified in IEEE Std 802.3 Clause 57 provided an extension mechanism that could be applied as an ONT related OAM, but we desire an ITU-T Recommendation G.984.4 OMCI-like expandable mechanism also. We'll continue to study the OAM structure further. We agreed as follows at the June Q2 interim meeting.

Loss budget: The ODN requirement consistent with ITU-T Recommendation G.985

- Class S: optical path loss 15 dB, power penalty 1 dB for the transmission within 10 km.
- Class A: optical path loss 20 dB, power penalty 1 dB for the transmission within 20 km.
- Class B: optical path loss 25 dB, power penalty 1 dB for the transmission within 30 km.

Some physical layer specifications were also agreed. We expect to prepare and attach a draft ITU-T Recommendation G.gbe including these specifications to the next liaison letter. Q2/15 appreciates further communication from the 802.3 working group if there are any comments or requests. Our next interim meeting is scheduled on 12 September.
