IEEE 802.3av Draft 3.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl 00 SC 0 P  L</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment Type</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Comment Status D True/False</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggested Remedy</td>
<td></td>
<td>[Submitted on behalf of Duane Remein] Inconsistent use of boolean &quot;false&quot; (sometimes &quot;FALSE&quot;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Response</td>
<td></td>
<td>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response Status</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>[The comment is against unchanged text, therefore is outside the scope of this recirculation ballot]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl 00 SC 0 P  L</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment Type</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Comment Status D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggested Remedy</td>
<td></td>
<td>Removal of Revision Tables from individual clauses and add to frontmatter just after existing Editor's Note. Use table from 3av_0905_remein_1.pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Response</td>
<td></td>
<td>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response Status</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>[The comment is against unchanged text, therefore is outside the scope of this recirculation ballot]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl 00 SC 0 P  L</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment Type</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Comment Status D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggested Remedy</td>
<td></td>
<td>Definition of EOB is plain old strange. END_BURST_DELIMITER without reference to proper definition means nothing. Remove it altogether with brackets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Response</td>
<td></td>
<td>PROPOSED REJECT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response Status</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>[The comment is against unchanged text, therefore is outside the scope of this recirculation ballot]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

802.3av 10G-EPON comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl 01 SC 1.3 P 21 L 4</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment Type ER</td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment Status D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggested Remedy</td>
<td></td>
<td>[Submitted on behalf of Pete Anslow] This says &quot;insert after ITU-T Recommendation G.9752&quot; but G.9752 does not exist in the base document.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Response</td>
<td></td>
<td>W PROPOSED ACCEPT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response Status</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>[The comment is against unchanged text, therefore is outside the scope of this recirculation ballot]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl 01 SC 1.4.95 P 21 L 42</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment Type ER</td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment Status D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggested Remedy</td>
<td></td>
<td>Change &quot;IEEE 802.3&quot; to &quot;IEEE 802.3 Clause 38&quot; shown in strikethrough font.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Response</td>
<td></td>
<td>W PROPOSED ACCEPT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response Status</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>[The comment is against unchanged text, therefore is outside the scope of this recirculation ballot]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl 01 SC 1.5 P 22 L 11</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment Type T</td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment Status D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggested Remedy</td>
<td></td>
<td>Change definition of EOB to read &quot;EOB&lt;tab&gt;end of burst delimiter&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Response</td>
<td></td>
<td>W PROPOSED ACCEPT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response Status</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>[The comment is against unchanged text, therefore is outside the scope of this recirculation ballot]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 802.3av 10G-EPON comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CI</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Comment Type</th>
<th>Comment Status</th>
<th>Suggested Remedy</th>
<th>Proposed Response</th>
<th>Response Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>ER</td>
<td>D</td>
<td><strong>EPON = Ethernet Passive Optical Network. Strike &quot;s&quot; at the end of the acronym expansion.</strong></td>
<td>Proposed ACCEPT.</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>ER</td>
<td>D</td>
<td><strong>OUI = Organizationally Unique Identifier. Strike &quot;s&quot; at the end of the acronym expansion.</strong></td>
<td>Proposed ACCEPT.</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Proposed responses

- **CI 01 SC 1.5 P 22 L 12 # 19**
  - Hajduczenia, Marek
  - ZTE Corp.
  - Comment Type: ER
  - Comment Status: D
  - Proposed Response: Per comment.
  - Suggested Remedy: Proposed ACCEPT.
  - Response Status: W

- **CI 01 SC 1.5 P 22 L 14 # 5**
  - Hajduczenia, Marek
  - ZTE Corp.
  - Comment Type: ER
  - Comment Status: D
  - Proposed Response: Per comment.
  - Suggested Remedy: Proposed ACCEPT.
  - Response Status: W

- **CI 30 SC 30.3.7.1.5 P 27 L 18 # 5**
  - Hajduczenia, Marek
  - ZTE Corp.
  - Comment Type: T
  - Comment Status: D
  - Proposed Response: Definition of aGoodLLID says "A count of frames received that contain a valid SLD field, as defined in 65.1.3.3.1 or 76.2.6.1.3.1, as appropriate, and pass the CRC-8 check, as defined in 65.1.3.3.3.," which is does not match the current standard. Change "aGoodLLID" to "aGood LLID" and "A count of frames received that contain a valid SLD field in an OLT, as defined in 65.1.3.3.3., and pass the CRC-8 check, as defined in 65.1.3.3.3.," underline the phrase "or 76.2.6.1.3.1, as appropriate" to indicate changed text.
  - Suggested Remedy: Proposed ACCEPT.
  - Response Status: W

**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**: Clause, Subclause, page, line
Comment Type: T  Comment Status: Pg 27 in 18 [Submitted on behalf of Piers Dawe]

In the following: A count of frames received that contain a valid SLD field, as defined in 65.1.3.3.1 or 76.2.6.1.3.1, as appropriate, but passes the CRC-8 check as defined in....

Suggested Remedy
Should that be _and_ passes?

Proposed Response Response Status: W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
See response to comment #5 which aligns the text to the current standard.

Comment Type: TR  Comment Status: Pg 27 in 18

Badly implemented comment #63. The text says "but passes the CRC--8" while it should say "and passes the CRC--8". See 3av_0903_comments_d3_0_accepted.pdf from March meeting in Vancouver

Suggested Remedy
Fix it accordingly

Proposed Response Response Status: W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
See response to comment #5 which aligns the text to the current standard.

Comment Type: E  Comment Status: D  [Submitted on behalf of Seiji Kozaki]

Typo

Suggested Remedy
Change "65.1.3.3.2 pr 76.2.6.1.3.2" to "65.1.3.3.2 or 76.2.6.1.3.2"

Proposed Response Response Status: W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.
[The comment is against unchanged text, therefore is outside the scope of this recirculation ballot]

In the text, words "D1", "D2", "D3", "U1", "U2", "U3" are attached to their next words without space.

Suggested Remedy
Add a space after the words.

Proposed Response Response Status: W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
[The comment is against unchanged text, therefore is outside the scope of this recirculation ballot]

In the source material there is actually a tab character. The style for the 6 paragraphs will be changed to ensure there is reasonable space between these words.

Proposed Response Response Status: W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
[The comment is against unchanged text, therefore is outside the scope of this recirculation ballot]

There are 10 occurrences of "ability register" and only 5 occurrences of "abilities register" (outside TOC and discounting capitalization). Change 5 instances of "abilities register" to "ability register" using care to follow IEEE Style guide wrt capitalization (Pg 40 In 45, 47, 48 & 49, Pg 41 Ln 1). Remove forest green font as this is a live link.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CI</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>Comment Type</th>
<th>Comment Status</th>
<th>Proposed Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>45.2.1.10</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>45.2.1.11</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>PER COMMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>45.2.3.29</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>PROPOSED REJECT.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hajduczenia, Marek
ZTE Corp.

**Comment:**

This should be "PMA/PMD extended ability register" (as it is twice in the base document just above) - bug in base document

**Suggested Remedy:**

Remove one of them

**Proposed Response:**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

See resolution to comment #41

**Comment:**

Two times "45.2.1.6.1"

**Suggested Remedy:**

Consider reinstating the FEC error indication ability bit but always set to one, like the 10 Gb/s FEC ability bit.

**Proposed Response:**

PROPOSED REJECT.

The task force consider this question in the Vancouver 09 meeting and it was agreed to remove the FEC error indication ability bit.

**Comment:**

Delete one occurrence of 45.2.1.6.1

**Suggested Remedy:**

See resolution to comment #15

**Proposed Response:**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

In the table: This bit indicates that the 10 Gb/s FEC decoder component of the PCS is able to indicate decoding errors to higher layers (mandatory for 10/1GBASE-PRX or 10GBASE-PR). In a 10/1GBASE-PRX OLT, this bit is undefined. In 45.2.3.29.1 this bit indicates that the 10 Gb/s FEC decoder component of the 10GBASE-PR or 10/1GBASE-PRX PCS is able to indicate decoding errors to the higher layers (see 76.3.3.3). The bit always reads as one for 10/1GBASE-PRX or 10GBASE-PR. FEC error indication is controlled by a bit in the 10GBASE-PR and 10/1GBASE-PRX FEC control register (see 45.2.3.30.1).

**Proposed Response:**

PROPOSED REJECT.

In the table: This bit indicates that the 10 Gb/s FEC decoder component of the PCS is able to indicate decoding errors to higher layers (mandatory for 10/1GBASE-PRX or 10GBASE-PR). In a 10/1GBASE-PRX OLT, this bit is undefined. In 45.2.3.29.1 this bit indicates that the 10 Gb/s FEC decoder component of the 10GBASE-PR or 10/1GBASE-PRX PCS is able to indicate decoding errors to the higher layers (see 76.3.3.3). The bit always reads as one for 10/1GBASE-PRX or 10GBASE-PR. FEC error indication is controlled by a bit in the 10GBASE-PR and 10/1GBASE-PRX FEC control register (see 45.2.3.30.1).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CI</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Proposed Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>45.2.3.30</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment Type: E</td>
<td>Writes should be writes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment Status: D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Suggested Remedy: Per comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed Response: PROPOSED ACCEPT.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[The comment is against unchanged text, therefore is outside the scope of this recirculation ballot]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CI</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Proposed Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>45.2.3.31</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>103</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kimura, Mitsunobu Hitachi Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment Type: G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment Status: D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Suggested Remedy: Match the order of &quot;10GBASE-PR&quot; and &quot;10/1GBASE-PRX&quot; between index and body.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed Response: PROPOSED ACCEPT.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CI</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Proposed Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>45.2.3.32</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kimura, Mitsunobu Hitachi Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment Type: G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment Status: D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Suggested Remedy: Change the index to &quot;10/1GBASE-PRX and 10GBASE-PR FEC uncorrected codewords&quot;.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed Response: PROPOSED ACCEPT.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CI</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Proposed Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>45.2.3.33</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment Type: E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment Status: D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Suggested Remedy: Per comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed Response: PROPOSED ACCEPT.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[The comment is against unchanged text, therefore is outside the scope of this recirculation ballot]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Pg 45 Ln 35, 37 &amp; 42)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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: Clause, Subclause, page, line

Page 5 of 22
30-04-2009 19:55:18
Comment Type: T
Comment Status: D
[Submitted on behalf of Piers Dawe]
Registers are always there, whether the features are supported or not. Placement of only.

SuggestedRemedy
Change "This register is only required when 10GBASE-PR or 10/1GBASE-PRX ONU capability is supported" to "This register is defined only if 10GBASE-PR or 10/1GBASE-PRX ONU capability is supported..." Similarly in 45.2.3.34

Proposed Response
Response Status: W
PROPOSED REJECT.
[The comment is against unchanged text, therefore is outside the scope of this recirculation ballot]
Implementations (for example 100BASE-T implementations) may reasonable be expected not to support the register if it is not needed. The wording is correct as is.

Comment Type: E
Comment Status: D
[Submitted on behalf of Piers Dawe]
Too much text in the table
Implementations (for example 100BASE-T implementations) may reasonable be expected not to support the register if it is not needed. The wording is correct as is.

Proposed Response
Response Status: W
PROPOSED REJECT.
The Editor respectfully disagrees with this opinion.

Comment Type: E
Comment Status: D
[Submitted on behalf of Piers Dawe]
microseconds should be us (with Greek omicron)

Proposed Response
Response Status: W
PROPOSED REJECT.
Use of the full word is equally clear, if not more so.

Comment Type: TR
Comment Status: D
[Submitted on behalf of Piers Dawe]
Table 45-111’s title has "bit definitions" while Table 45-112 doesn’t. Capitals. Missing a "Monitor".

SuggestedRemedy
Change to:
45.2.3.34 10GBASE-PR and 10/1GBASE-PRX BER Monitor status register (Register 3.81) The assignments of bits in the 10GBASE-PR and 10/1GBASE-PRX BER Monitor status register is shown in Table 45-112. Table 45-112-10GBASE-PR and 10/1GBASE-PRX BER Monitor status register bit definitions

Proposed Response
Response Status: W
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
[The comment is against unchanged text, therefore is outside the scope of this recirculation ballot]
Change from:
"45.2.3.34 10GBASE-PR and 10/1GBASE-PRX BER Monitor Status (Register 3.81)" "The assignments of bits in the 10GBASE-PR and 10/1GBASE-PRX BER Status Register is shown in Table 45–112. This register …"
To:
"45.2.3.34 10GBASE-PR and 10/1GBASE-PRX BER monitor status (Register 3.81)" "The assignments of bits in the 10GBASE-PR and 10/1GBASE-PRX BER monitor status register is shown in Table 45–112. This register …"

Proposed Response
Response Status: W
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
[The comment is against unchanged text, therefore is outside the scope of this recirculation ballot]
Change from:
"45.2.3.34 10GBASE-PR and 10/1GBASE-PRX BER Monitor Status (Register 3.81)" "The assignments of bits in the 10GBASE-PR and 10/1GBASE-PRX BER Status Register is shown in Table 45–112. This register …"
To:
"45.2.3.34 10GBASE-PR and 10/1GBASE-PRX BER monitor status (Register 3.81)" "The assignments of bits in the 10GBASE-PR and 10/1GBASE-PRX BER monitor status register is shown in Table 45–112. This register …"

Proposed Response
Response Status: W
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
[The comment is against unchanged text, therefore is outside the scope of this recirculation ballot]
Change from:
"45.2.3.34 10GBASE-PR and 10/1GBASE-PRX BER Monitor Status (Register 3.81)" "The assignments of bits in the 10GBASE-PR and 10/1GBASE-PRX BER Status Register is shown in Table 45–112. This register …"
To:
"45.2.3.34 10GBASE-PR and 10/1GBASE-PRX BER monitor status (Register 3.81)" "The assignments of bits in the 10GBASE-PR and 10/1GBASE-PRX BER monitor status register is shown in Table 45–112. This register …"
802.3av 10G-EPON comments

802.3av Draft 3.2

Hajduczenia, Marek
ZTE Corp.

Comment Type E Comment Status D

[Submitted on behalf of Piers Dawe]
66.5.3 Put a space between [ and ] several times

Suggested Remedy

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
[The comment is against unchanged text, therefore is outside the scope of this recirculation ballot]
Global Change "[" to "["].

Hajduczenia, Marek
ZTE Corp.

Comment Type E Comment Status D

[Submitted on behalf of Piers Dawe]
Don't need "measurements": the "shall" is in "The TDP limit shall be met." It's optional for OM2 Wavelength and spectral width; would save space to remove.

Suggested Remedy

Delete "measurements" in OM8, consider same for OM2

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.
[The comment is against unchanged text, therefore is outside the scope of this recirculation ballot]

Hajduczenia, Marek
ZTE Corp.

Comment Type E Comment Status D

[Submitted on behalf of Piers Dawe]
Operating temperature range labeling is mandatory

Suggested Remedy

Delete "N/A[ ]"

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.
[The comment is against unchanged text, therefore is outside the scope of this recirculation ballot]

Proposed responses

Hajduczenia, Marek
ZTE Corp.

Comment Type E Comment Status D

In Table 75-5, Table 75–6, there is extra "and" between names of individual PMDs associated with the given columns; in Table 75–11 there is no such surrious "and" even though more than 1 PMD is associated with the particular columns; decide either way but make is consistent in Clause 75

Suggested Remedy

Suggest to remove "and" from Table 75-5 and 75-6 (will not mark the whole table as changed)

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Hajduczenia, Marek
ZTE Corp.

Comment Type E Comment Status D

[Submitted on behalf of Piers Dawe]
Paragraph split over two pages

Suggested Remedy

Set Table 75-9 to float

Proposed Response Response Status W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
[The comment is against unchanged text, therefore is outside the scope of this recirculation ballot]
Tables will be set to float in all cases where it is necessary. Here, in plain text file, the table is in correct format i.e. does not split between two pages.
Comment Type T Comment Status D
[Submitted on behalf of Piers Dawe]
Why is there a section for receiver 3 dB electrical upper cutoff frequency when there is no spec or even recommendation for it?

Suggested Remedy
Either add specs or recommendations, or delete 75.7.14, row of Table 75-13 and PICS OM12

Proposed Response Response Status W
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
[The comment is against unchanged text, therefore is outside the scope of this recirculation ballot]
3dB electrical upper cutoff frequency definition should be added.
Note that this parameter is also used e.g. in clause 52 or 59 without providing such a definition. A simple reference to measurement method is made.

Comment Type T Comment Status D
[Submitted on behalf of Piers Dawe]
Don't use * for multiply. More technically, "bitRate" is not defined, and the filter used for 10G is not 0.75 * signalling rate, but 7.5 GHz. Do you think you can hold the 10G filter to STM-16 (2.5G) tolerances? Clause 52 couldn't.

Suggested Remedy
Change:
Bessel-Thomson receiver response with fr = 0.75 * bitRate, and where the relative response vs. relative frequency is defined in ITU-T G.957, Table B.2 (STM-16 values), along with the allowed tolerances for its physical implementation.
to
Bessel-Thomson receiver response as defined in 60.7.8 for 1 Gb/s PMD transmitters and 52.9.7 for 10 Gb/s PMD transmitters.

Proposed Response Response Status W
PROPOSED ACCEPT.
[The comment is against unchanged text, therefore is outside the scope of this recirculation ballot]

Comment Type T Comment Status D
[Submitted on behalf of Piers Dawe]
downstream_baudrate should be downstream_signaling_rate line

Suggested Remedy
PROPOSED ACCEPT.
[The comment is against unchanged text, therefore is outside the scope of this recirculation ballot]
Confirm that a change in the units does not change the parameter values.

Comment Type T Comment Status D
[Submitted on behalf of Piers Dawe]

Suggested Remedy
PROPOSED ACCEPT.
[The comment is against unchanged text, therefore is outside the scope of this recirculation ballot]
Confirm that a change in the units does not change the parameter values.
IEEE 802.3av Draft 3.2

802.3av 10G-EPON comments

Proposed responses

---

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

[Submitted on behalf of Piers Dawe]

**What mechanism?**

**Suggested Remedy**

Change to "this protocol"?

**Proposed Response**

**Response Status** W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

[The comment is against unchanged text, therefore is outside the scope of this recirculation ballot]

Change "mechanism" to "standard"

---

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

[Submitted on behalf of Piers Dawe]

"data links which transmit" should be "data links that transmit". Anyway, the link doesn't unambiguously "transmit" and "receive" because it has two ends.

**Suggested Remedy**

Should be something like "links with one data rate (e.g. 10 Gb/s) in one direction but another (e.g. 1 Gb/s) in the opposite direction"

**Proposed Response**

**Response Status** W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Change from:

"This subclause extends Clause 46 to enable multiple data link layers to interface with a single physical layer, and to enable data links which transmit at one data rate (e.g. 10 Gb/s) and receive at another data rate (e.g. 1 Gb/s)."

To:

"This subclause extends Clause 46 to enable multiple data link layers to interface with a single physical layer, and to enable data links that transmit at one data rate and receive at another data rate."

---

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

[Submitted on behalf of Piers Dawe]

"Data Link Layers to interface with a single Physical Layer"? See 802.3 editor's style guide.

**Suggested Remedy**

"Data Link Layers to interface with a single Physical Layer"? See 802.3 editor's style guide.

**Proposed Response**

**Response Status** W

PROPOSED REJECT.

[The comment is against unchanged text, therefore is outside the scope of this recirculation ballot]

An examination of the 2009 Style Guide shows no preference regarding Data Link Layers vs data link layers.

---

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

[Submitted on behalf of Piers Dawe]

What does "binding" mean? Later on the same word is used in a different context "binding of an ONU to an OLT port". There's a mix of "mapping" and "binding" here and in 76.2.6; should use same word for same thing, each time.

**Suggested Remedy**

Change "binding" to "mapping", three times.

**Proposed Response**

**Response Status** W

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

[The comment is against unchanged text, therefore is outside the scope of this recirculation ballot]

Change "binding" to "mapping" in 3 places (pg 113 In 50, pg 115 In 7 & 22).
802.3av 10G-EPON comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Proposed Response</th>
<th>Comment Status</th>
<th>Response Status</th>
<th>Proposed Response</th>
<th>Comment Status</th>
<th>Response Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unit 76, SC 76.3.2.1 P 117 L 52 # 67</td>
<td>Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.</td>
<td>802.3av 10G-EPON comments</td>
<td>&quot;no further explicit specification&quot;?</td>
<td>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</td>
<td>&quot;no further explicit specification&quot;?</td>
<td>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Type</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Comment Status</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>802.3av 10G-EPON comments</td>
<td>SuggestedRemedy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Submitted on behalf of Piers Dawe]</td>
<td></td>
<td>802.3av 10G-EPON comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>something masking top of &quot;PCS&quot;; also in line 30</td>
<td></td>
<td>802.3av 10G-EPON comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SuggestedRemedy</td>
<td></td>
<td>802.3av 10G-EPON comments</td>
<td>Per comment</td>
<td>802.3av 10G-EPON comments</td>
<td>Per comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Response</td>
<td>Response Status</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>802.3av 10G-EPON comments</td>
<td>Proposed Response</td>
<td>Response Status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 76, SC 76.3.2 P 118 L 11 # 72</td>
<td>Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.</td>
<td>802.3av 10G-EPON comments</td>
<td>something masking top of &quot;PCS&quot;; also in line 30</td>
<td>PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.</td>
<td>something masking top of &quot;PCS&quot;; also in line 30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Type</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Comment Status</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>802.3av 10G-EPON comments</td>
<td>SuggestedRemedy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Submitted on behalf of Piers Dawe]</td>
<td></td>
<td>802.3av 10G-EPON comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>capitalization is the same as found in Figure 49-4 of the current standard.</td>
<td></td>
<td>802.3av 10G-EPON comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SuggestedRemedy</td>
<td></td>
<td>802.3av 10G-EPON comments</td>
<td>Per comment</td>
<td>802.3av 10G-EPON comments</td>
<td>Per comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Response</td>
<td>Response Status</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>802.3av 10G-EPON comments</td>
<td>Proposed Response</td>
<td>Response Status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 76-5 looks correct. Editor will work on Figure 76-6.</td>
<td></td>
<td>802.3av 10G-EPON comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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: Clause, Subclause, page, line

Page 10 of 22
30-04-2009 19:55:18
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl</th>
<th>SC 76.3.2.4</th>
<th>P 124</th>
<th>L 7</th>
<th># 74</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hajduczenia, Marek</td>
<td>ZTE Corp.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Type</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Comment Status</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Submitted on behalf of Piers Dawe]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document uses a mix of &quot;FEC F/frame&quot; and &quot;FEC block&quot;. Need to pick one: KR uses &quot;FEC block&quot; almost exclusively. Make 9 changes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggested Remedy</td>
<td>Per comment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Response</td>
<td>Response Status</td>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change all instances of &quot;FEC frame&quot; and &quot;FEC Frame&quot; to &quot;FEC block&quot;.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full document search only finds 7 instances for FEC F/frame (pg 124 ln 8, pg 127 ln 35, pg 128 ln 4, pg 140 ln 34, pg 158 ln 6, 30 &amp; 31).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl</th>
<th>SC 76.3.2.5</th>
<th>P 128</th>
<th>L 16</th>
<th># 76</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hajduczenia, Marek</td>
<td>ZTE Corp.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Type</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Comment Status</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Submitted on behalf of Piers Dawe]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;one packet of a maximum length (forty 66-bit blocks).&quot; 320 bytes? The maximum 802.3 MAC frame is 2000 bytes so the maximum packet is similar: about 250 66-bit blocks. This isn't right.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggested Remedy</td>
<td>Per comment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Response</td>
<td>Response Status</td>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change last sentence from</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;The length of the FIFO_DD buffer should be large enough to hold the amount of data equal to the maximum amount of parity data that may be inserted within the transmission time of one packet of a maximum length (forty 66-bit blocks).&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;The length of the FIFO_DD buffer should be large enough to hold the maximum amount of parity data that may be inserted within the transmission time of one packet of a maximum length (at most forty 66-bit blocks of parity data).&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl</th>
<th>SC 76.3.2.5.1</th>
<th>P 128</th>
<th>L 10</th>
<th># 23</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hajduczenia, Marek</td>
<td>ZTE Corp.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Type</td>
<td>TR</td>
<td>Comment Status</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Submitted on behalf of Piers Dawe]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Removal of Figure 76-14 was justified at the time, though in the long run, we lose some solid piece of explanation on how Data Detector works in graphical terms. I think it is worth considering bringing the Figure back but with modifications, as proposed in 3av_0905_hajduczenia_3.pdf. Changes to the text in 76.3.2.5.1 are also marked in the file.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggested Remedy</td>
<td>Per comment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Response</td>
<td>Response Status</td>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROPOSED REJECT.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The expressing given in the comment all equate to the same thing. Two (decimal) is still two (binary or hex) regardless of the base used to express it. We have simply used hex as clearly denoted by the &quot;0x&quot; which was obviously clear to the comment author.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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: Clause, Subclause, page, line
802.3av 10G-EPON comments

Proposed responses

Cl 76 SC 76.3.3.1 P 136 L 18 # 7
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type T Comment Status D
[Submitted on behalf of Piers Dawe]
31*66 blocks? See style guide and editor's web page for proper multiplication sign. Should this be "31, 66-bit blocks"? Same in 76.3.3.2.

Suggested Remedy
Per comment

Proposed Response Response Status W
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
[The comment is against unchanged text, therefore is outside the scope of this recirculation ballot]

Cl 76 SC 76.3.3.1 P 136 L 19 # 8
Hajduczenia, Marek ZTE Corp.

Comment Type T Comment Status D
[Submitted on behalf of Duane Remein]
Wordsmything Similar to comment 163 in D3.0

Suggested Remedy
Change:
"When in codeword lock, the state diagram accumulates the appropriate contents of the 31 blocks that constitute a codeword in an input buffer."
to:
"While in codeword lock, the synchronizer copies the FEC-protected bits from each data block and the parity bits of the codeword into an input buffer."

Proposed Response Response Status W
PROPOSED ACCEPT.
[The comment is against unchanged text, therefore is outside the scope of this recirculation ballot]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl</th>
<th>SC 76.3.3.1.1</th>
<th>P 136</th>
<th>L 52</th>
<th># 78</th>
<th>Hajduczenia, Marek</th>
<th>ZTE Corp.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment Type</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Comment Status</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Submitted on behalf of Piers Dawe]</td>
<td>Justify or remove [] in inbuffer[] Also 76.3.3.3.1 outbuffer[]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SuggestedRemedy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Response</td>
<td>Response Status</td>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per comment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[The comment is against unchanged text, therefore is outside the scope of this recirculation ballot]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The draft contains 13 variables declared as arrays. 7 use no subscripts in the declaration, 2 use &quot;&lt;&quot; and 4 use &quot;]&quot;. IEEE Style guide and Editors info WEB Pages do not address the issue.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The editors suggest rationalizing all array variable definitions. See 3av_0905_remein_2.pdf for details on this proposal.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl</th>
<th>SC 76.3.3.2</th>
<th>P 140</th>
<th>L 1</th>
<th># 60</th>
<th>Hajduczenia, Marek</th>
<th>ZTE Corp.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment Type</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Comment Status</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Submitted on behalf of Piers Dawe]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 76-19-PCS Receive bit ordering? Explain / clarify the caption</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SuggestedRemedy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Response</td>
<td>Response Status</td>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per comment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROPOSED REJECT.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The commenter has indicated his intention to withdraw this comment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl</th>
<th>SC 76.3.3.3</th>
<th>P 143</th>
<th>L 8</th>
<th># 81</th>
<th>Hajduczenia, Marek</th>
<th>ZTE Corp.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment Type</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Comment Status</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Submitted on behalf of Piers Dawe]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>false or FALSE?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SuggestedRemedy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Response</td>
<td>Response Status</td>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choose one and use consistently in all clauses.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[The comment is against unchanged text, therefore is outside the scope of this recirculation ballot]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[should be against Clause 00]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See resolution to comment #9.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Proposed responses**

- **TYPE:** TR/technical required  ER/editorial required  GR/general required  T/technical  E/editorial  G/general
- **COMMENT STATUS:** D/dispatched  A/accepted  R/rejected  P/proposed  E/electricity  H/hardware  C/software  S/strategy
- **RESPONSE STATUS:** O/open  W/written  C/closed  U/unsatisfied  Z/withdrawn
- **SORT ORDER:** Clause, Subclause, page, line

30-04-2009 19:55:19
Comment Type: T  Comment Status: D
[Submitted on behalf of Piers Dawe]
Text says “then each sync header of the received payload blocks in the FEC codeword is set to a value of binary 00. However, the data blocks are nevertheless passed to the descrambler to maintain descrambling synchronization.” There are 31, 66-bit blocks in a codeword, right? Per Fig 49-16, it takes 16 bad sync headers to trip out of block lock and start slipping again. Is this really what you want; a single uncorrectable FEC codeword pulls the link down (even if not for very long)?

Suggested Remedy
Per comment

Proposed Response  Response Status: W
PROPOSED REJECT.
An option exists to allow each block to be passed unchanged. The downside of this is that the rate of false frame acceptance is increased (hence it is an option).

Comment Type: E  Comment Status: D
[Submitted on behalf of Piers Dawe]
What TYPE?

Suggested Remedy
Change to "TYPE: array"

Proposed Response  Response Status: W
PROPOSED ACCEPT.
[The comment is against unchanged text, therefore is outside the scope of this recirculation ballot]

Comment Type: T  Comment Status: D
[Submitted on behalf of Duane Remein] 
BlockToDescrambler should be BlockToDescrambler()

Suggested Remedy
replace BlockToDescrambler with BlockToDescrambler()

Proposed Response  Response Status: W
PROPOSED ACCEPT.
[The comment is against unchanged text, therefore is outside the scope of this recirculation ballot]

Comment Type: G  Comment Status: D  pg 145 in 46
"10/1GBASE-PRS-U" is shown.

Suggested Remedy
Change "10/1GBASE-PRS-U" to "10/1GBASE-PRX-U".

Proposed Response  Response Status: W
PROPOSED ACCEPT.
Comment Type T  Comment Status D
[Submitted on behalf of Piers Dawe]
The FEC decoding process function. Delete "function"?

Suggested Remedy
Per comment

Proposed Response  Response Status W
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Comment Type T  Comment Status D
[Submitted on behalf of Piers Dawe]
The following objects apply to 10G-EPON PCS management. Should that be objectives? If you mean objects, there is no mention of "objects" except in Clause 30. Anyway, why is this paragraph under a heading "BER Monitor control"? If you want to talk about the link between Clause 76 and (optional) MDIO, that's usually done near the beginning of each sublayer's (sub)clause.

Suggested Remedy
Change the word "objects" to "paragraphs".

Proposed Response  Response Status W
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

Comment Type T  Comment Status D
[Submitted on behalf of Seiji Kozaki]
In Figure 76-22, the moving condition from BER_BAD_SH to BER_TEST_SH is wrong. To understand clearly, please see and compare with Figure 49-13.

Suggested Remedy
Change "ber_test_sh * ber_cnt < ber_threshold * interval_timer_done" to "ber_test_sh * ber_cnt < ber_threshold * !interval_timer_done".

Proposed Response  Response Status W
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Comment Type T  Comment Status D
[Submitted on behalf of Duane Remein]
T_TYPE defined twice, once in 76.3.2.1.3 "T_TYPE( tx_raw<71:0> )" and again in 76.3.3.7.3. "T_TYPE( rx_raw )". This function is defined in 49.2.13.2.3.

Suggested Remedy
In remove definition in 76.3.3.7.3 and refer back to definition in 76.3.2.1.3.

Proposed Response  Response Status W
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Comment Type T  Comment Status D
[Submitted on behalf of Duane Remein]
Subclause 76A.2, Table 76A-1 may be mis-interperated. Is it read in rows or in columns?

Suggested Remedy
Add a footnote stating the table is to be read left to right, top to bottom.

Proposed Response  Response Status W
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

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: Clause, Subclause, page, line
802.3av 10G-EPON comments

Comment Type: E  Comment Status: D
[Submitted on behalf of Piers Dawe]
76A FEC Frame Encoding example should be FEC block encoding example,

Suggested Remedy
Per comment

Proposed Response  Response Status: W
PROPOSED ACCEPT.
[The comment is against unchanged text, therefore is outside the scope of this recirculation ballot]
See resolution to comment #74.

Comment Type: E  Comment Status: D
[Submitted on behalf of Piers Dawe]
76A.2 64B/66B Block Input should be 64B/66B block input

Suggested Remedy
Per comment

Proposed Response  Response Status: W
PROPOSED ACCEPT.
[The comment is against unchanged text, therefore is outside the scope of this recirculation ballot]

Comment Type: T  Comment Status: D
Table 76A-7 could be more readable if it was presented in two columns only - see 3av_0905_hajduczenia_2.pdf

Suggested Remedy
Per comment.

Proposed Response  Response Status: W
PROPOSED REJECT.
[The comment is against unchanged text, therefore is outside the scope of this recirculation ballot]
The table is presented in the same format as Table 76A-1 for consistency. The tables in cl 76A are also provided in machine readable format so a reader can easily import and re-formate to their hearts content.

Comment Type: E  Comment Status: D
Figure 77-4: White stuff over text? line 41

Suggested Remedy
Remove the offending element

Proposed Response  Response Status: W
PROPOSED ACCEPT.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Proposed Response</th>
<th>Response Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>77.2.2.1</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>T D</td>
<td>Change from 148 to 223. Change line 41 (FEC_PAYLOAD_SIZE) from 216 to 223.</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>77.2.2.7</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>T D</td>
<td>Revise as in 3av_0509_mandin_1.pdf</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>77.3.2.1</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>G D</td>
<td>Match the font size of index of each state in Figure 77-13 to the ones in Figure 77-12 and 77-14.</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>77.3.2.1</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>G D</td>
<td>Revise as in 3av_0509_mandin_1.pdf</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment Type T**

**Comment Status D**

Submit on behalf of Duane Remein

"FEC_CODEWORD_SIZE value appears to be in error."

**Suggested Remedy**

Change from 148 to 223. Change line 41 (FEC_PAYLOAD_SIZE) from 216 to 223.

**Proposed Response**

**Response Status W**

**PROPOSED REJECT.**

The comment is against unchanged text, therefore is outside the scope of this recirculation ballot.

The values are correct.

FEC_Dsize = 27 x (72 [2xXGMMI transfer] - 8 [control bits for 2xXGMMI transfer]) = 1728 b = 216 B

FEC_Psize = 4 x (72 [2xXGMMI transfer] - 8 [control bits for 2xXGMMI transfer]) = 32 B

All in all, FEC_CODEWORD_SIZE = 248 B (excluding 64b/66b encoding data), which is invisible at MACC level.

**Comment Type E**

**Comment Status D**

[Submitted on behalf of Piers Dawe]

Unnecessarily small font: 8 is minimum unless you are desperate for space (not here)

**Suggested Remedy**

Change most or all 7 point (or smaller) to 8 point

**Proposed Response**

**Response Status W**

**PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.**

The comment is against unchanged text, therefore is outside the scope of this recirculation ballot.

Will try to accommodate the commenter though change in the font size will be marked as text change.

**Comment Type G**

**Comment Status D**

Text size

In Figure 77-13, font size of index of each state, e.g. ("INIT", "WAIT FOR TRANSMIT", "TRANSMIT READY", "PARSE OPCODE", etc.) is bigger than Figure 77-12 and Figure 77-14.

**Suggested Remedy**

Match the font size of index of each state in Figure 77-13 to the ones in Figure 77-12 and 77-14.

**Proposed Response**

**Response Status W**

**PROPOSED ACCEPT.**

The comment is against unchanged text, therefore is outside the scope of this recirculation ballot.

Will try to accommodate the commenter though change in the font size will be marked as text change (Figure 77-12).
### 802.3av 10G-EPON Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Type</th>
<th>Comment Status</th>
<th>Suggested Remedy</th>
<th>Proposed Response</th>
<th>Response Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Text refers to sync pattern of 0x5555 and needs to be updated to reflect current sync pattern.

**Comment**

ONU sends a synchronization pattern (see 76.3.2.5.2) followed by a burst delimiter...

**Proposed Response**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

**Suggested Remedy**

Use the following condition instead of the specified:

(length[counter] > laserOnTime + syncTime + laserOffTime + tailGuard))

Where minGrantLength is defined as minGrantLength

**Type:** TR/technical required  
**ER:** editorial required  
**GR:** general required  
**T:** technical  
**E:** editorial  
**G:** general  

**COMMENT STATUS:** D/dispatched  
**R:** rejected  
**A:** accepted  

**RESPONSE STATUS:** O/open  
**C:** closed  
**U:** unsatisfied  
**Z:** withdrawn  

**SORT ORDER:** Clause, Subclause, page, line

---

802.3av Draft 3.2
Cl 77  SC 77.3.6.1  P 215  L 10  # 90
Hajduczenia, Marek  ZTE Corp.
Comment Type  T  Comment Status  D
[Submitted on behalf of Piers Dawe]
Bad filed name "OLT is 1G upstream capable"; should this be "OLT 1G upstream capability"?
Suggested Remedy
Per comment
Proposed Response  Response Status  W
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
[The comment is against unchanged text, therefore is outside the scope of this recirculation ballot]
Change "OLT is 1G upstream capable" to "OLT supports 1Gb/s reception"
Change "OLT is 10G upstream capable" to "OLT supports 10Gb/s reception"
Change "OLT does not support 1 Gb/s reception" to "No"
Change "OLT supports 1 Gb/s reception" to "No"
Change "OLT does not support 10 Gb/s reception" to "No"
Change "OLT supports 10 Gb/s reception" to "No"

Cl 77  SC 77.3.6.3  P 218  L 22  # 66
Hajduczenia, Marek  ZTE Corp.
Comment Type  E  Comment Status  D
[Submitted on behalf of Piers Dawe]
8 bit should be 8-bit
Suggested Remedy
Scrub the document.
Proposed Response  Response Status  W
PROPOSED ACCEPT.
[The comment is against unchanged text, therefore is outside the scope of this recirculation ballot]
d) Discovery Information. This is a 16-bit flag register. Table 77-6 presents the structure of the Discovery Information flag field. Table 77-6-REGISTER_REQ MPCPDU Discovery Information Fields should be d) Discovery Information. This is a 16-bit flag register. Table 77-6 presents the structure of the Discovery Information field. Table 77-6-REGISTER_REQ MPCPDU Discovery Information field

Cl 77  SC 77.3.6.3  P 247  L 27  # 61
Hajduczenia, Marek  ZTE Corp.
Comment Type  T  Comment Status  D
[Submitted on behalf of Piers Dawe]
d) Discovery Information. This is a 16-bit flag register. Table 77-6 presents the internal structure of the Discovery Information flag field. Table 77-6-REGISTER_REQ MPCPDU Discovery Information Fields should be d) Discovery Information. This is a 16-bit flag register. Table 77-6 presents the structure of the Discovery Information field. Table 77-6-REGISTER_REQ MPCPDU Discovery Information field
Suggested Remedy
Per comment
Proposed Response  Response Status  W
PROPOSED ACCEPT.
[The comment is against unchanged text, therefore is outside the scope of this recirculation ballot]
is d) Discovery Information. This is a 16-bit flag register. Table 77-6 presents the internal structure of the Discovery Information flag field. Table 77-6-REGISTER_REQ MPCPDU Discovery Information Fields should be d) Discovery Information. This is a 16-bit flag register. Table 77-6 presents the structure of the Discovery Information field. Table 77-6-REGISTER_REQ MPCPDU Discovery Information field
IEEE 802.3av Draft 3.2

802.3av 10G-EPON comments

Proposed responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CI 77</th>
<th>SC 77.3.6.5</th>
<th>P 220</th>
<th>L 10</th>
<th># 56</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hajduczenia, Marek</td>
<td>ZTE Corp.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

[Submitted on behalf of Piers Dawe]

Split Table 77-7 REGISTER MPCPDU Flags field

**Suggested Remedy:**

- Fix it

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

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

[The comment is against unchanged text, therefore is outside the scope of this recirculation ballot]

Will try to accomodate the commenter's request.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CI 77</th>
<th>SC 77.3.6.5</th>
<th>P 221</th>
<th>L 23</th>
<th># 65</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hajduczenia, Marek</td>
<td>ZTE Corp.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

[Submitted on behalf of Piers Dawe]

Strange term "higher-layer-entity" Use proper term, here and next page.

**Suggested Remedy:**

- Per comment

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

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

[The comment is against unchanged text, therefore is outside the scope of this recirculation ballot]

- "this" should be "This".
- Add a space after "registration".
- Delete text "Echoed assigned port. This field holds a 16-bit unsigned value reflecting the LLID of the port assigned following registration", as presented in Table 77-8. Table 77-8-REGISTER_ACK MPCPDU Flags fields says values 0 to 255 (8 bits).

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

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

[The comment is against unchanged text, therefore is outside the scope of this recirculation ballot]

- "this" should be "This".
- Add a space after "registration".
- Delete text "Echoed assigned port. This field holds a 16-bit unsigned value reflecting the LLID of the port assigned following registration" from bullet b

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CI 77</th>
<th>SC 77.3.6.5</th>
<th>P 250</th>
<th>L 37</th>
<th># 65</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hajduczenia, Marek</td>
<td>ZTE Corp.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

[Submitted on behalf of Piers Dawe]

Table width. Wasted space: set Figure 77-36-REGISTER_ACK MPCPDU to float?

**Suggested Remedy:**

- Per comment

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

[s/b Pg 222]

[was Clause 222 Subclause 222, s/b CI 77 SubCl 77.3.6.5, changed required to import into comment database tool]

[The comment is against unchanged text, therefore is outside the scope of this recirculation ballot]

Will try to accomodate the commenter's request.
802.3av 10G-EPON comments

**Comment**

Table 77-9 still using 1/1 Gb/s, 10/1 Gbps and 10/10 Gbps for ONT types.

**Suggested Remedy**

Change to 1G-EPON, 1/10G-EPON and 10/10G-EPON.

**Proposed Response**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

[The comment is against unchanged text, therefore is outside the scope of this recirculation ballot]

- Change 1/1 Gbit/s to 1G-EPON
- Change 10/1 Gbit/s to 10/1G-EPON
- Change 10/10 Gbit/s to 10/10G-EPON

**Comment**

Over-aggressive hyphenation

**Suggested Remedy**

Set hyphenated minimum to 3: Paragraph designer, Advanced, set shortest suffix to 3

**Proposed Response**

PROPOSED REJECT.

1) Per the IEEE Style Manual (section 13.6) “In most cases, compound adjectives (such as fiber-optic cable, lead-acid batteries, power-operated valve assemblies) should be hyphenated. IEEE-SA project editors check documents for consistency of hyphenation; when the working group has a decided preference (such as life cycle process), that preference will be enforced. The use of hyphenated multiple adjectives (such as compressed-air-actuated power tools) should be limited to cases where such use is necessary to ensure comprehension.” This implies the IEEE editors will have their way with hyphens, even overly aggressive ones.
2) The TOC (text this comment is about) is not part of the standard and will be removed before publication.
3) Manual style changes (which is what would have to be done in this case unless we want to risk unintended changes throughout the draft) are inherently error prone and should be avoided.

**Comment**

IEEE Std 802.3xx-200X

**Suggested Remedy**

Should this be IEEE Std 802.3av-200X? Also at line 40. If so, TM at p4 line 21 would appear earlier, not there.

**Proposed Response**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

[The comment is against unchanged text, therefore is outside the scope of this recirculation ballot]

Change two instances of "IEEE Std 802.3xx-200X" to "IEEE Std 802.3-2008" (Pg 3 In 13 & Ln 40). Change 1 instance of "P802.3xx" to "P802.3av" (Pg 6 In 3).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID</th>
<th>Clause</th>
<th>Subclause</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Comment Type</th>
<th>Comment Status</th>
<th>Suggested Remedy</th>
<th>Proposed Response</th>
<th>Response Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#32</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Should be IEEE Std 802.3-2008 Also at line 43</td>
<td>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#33</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>change &quot;is comprises of&quot; to &quot;is composed of&quot; or to &quot;comprises&quot;</td>
<td>PROPOSED REJECT.</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#34</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>As in P802.3bc, please change &quot;specify subscriber access physical layers and sublayers&quot; to...</td>
<td>PROPOSED REJECT.</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**
- **Comment Type:** E - Editorial, P - Technical
- **Comment Status:** D - Dispatched
- **Suggested Remedy:**
  - Should be IEEE Std 802.3-2008 Also at line 43
  - change "is comprises of" to "is composed of" or to "comprises"
  - As in P802.3bc, please change "specify subscriber access physical layers and sublayers" to...

**Proposed Response:**
- PROPOSED ACCEPT.
- PROPOSED REJECT.

**Response Status:**
- W - Written