## Draft 3.1

| $C I$ FM $\quad S C$ FM | $P 13$ | $L \mathbf{4 2}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Remein, Duane | Futurewei Technologie | \# r01-14 |

## Comment Type E Comment Status D

Amendment number has been set by Mr. Law
SuggestedRemedy
Add "Amendment 5-"
Proposed Response Response Status w
PROPOSED ACCEPT.


Comment Type E Comment Status D
Page 27 does not reflect the latest version of the 802.3 boilerplate.

## SuggestedRemedy

Change "Implementors" to "Implementers".
Proposed Response Response Status w
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

| $C l 00$ | $S C 0$ |
| :--- | :---: |
| Anslow, Peter | $P$ |
| $L$ |  |

\# r01-7

Comment Type E Comment Status D Clause order
The order of IEEE 802.3 amendments is to have all annexes after all clauses (as it was in
D3.0), as shown in the 802.3 FrameMaker template. In D3.1, Annex A and Annex 31A are interleaved with the clauses. Why was this change made?
SuggestedRemedy
Move Annex A and Annex 31A to be after Clause 103
Proposed Response Response Status W
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
REVISED
per comment and modify Editor Instruction on Pg 81 line 1 to per Staff editors input read: "Insert new clauses 100, 101, 102, 103, and Annex 100A as follows:"

| Cl 00 SC 0 | $P$ | $L$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Grow, Robert | RMG Consulting | \# r01-31 |

Comment Type G Comment Status D
You may mark all my D3.0 comments as satisfied as remaining errors are covered by comments on D3.1
SuggestedRemedy

Proposed Response Response Status W
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
REVISED
Thank you for this input.

| Cl 00 | SC 0 | $P 31$ | L1 | \# r01-15 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Remein, Duane |  | Futurewei Technologie |  |  |  |

Comment Type ER Comment Status D Clause order

Clauses mis-ordered

## SuggestedRemedy

Change to FM, 1, 30, 45, 56, 67, 76, 100, 101, 102, 103 Annex A, Annex 31A, Annex 100A.
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G/general COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

| $C l 45$ | $S C 45$ | $P$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Grow, Robert | RMG Consulting |  |

Comment Type E
Comment Status D

Verify the remainder of the numbering.

## SuggestedRemedy

Per comment
Proposed Response Response Status w
PROPOSED REJECT.
Standards are professionally edited by IEEE editors prior to publication.

| Cl 45 | $S C$ | 45.2.1 | P38 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Anslow, Peter | L 17 | \# r01-8 |  |
| 1 |  |  |  |

Anslow, Peter Ciena Corporation
Table 45-3
Comment Type E Comment Status D
(Page number from CMP version)
IEEE 802.3 bw-2015 made changes to Table $45-3$ which show 1.17 as Reserved.
SuggestedRemedy
Change the editing instruction to: "Change the reserved row for 1.17 in Table 45-3 (as inserted by IEEE Std 802.3bw-2015) as follows (unchanged rows not shown):"
inserted by IEEE Std 802.3bw-2015) as follows (unchanged rows not shown):"
in the row for 1.17 add "Reserved" in strikethrough font and underline "EPoC PMA/PMD
ability" in the "Register name" column, underline "45.2.1.14aa" and remove the row below.
Proposed Response
Response Status W
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

| Cl 45 | SC 45.2.1 | P38 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Grow, Robert | RMG Consulting |  |

Grow, Robert RMG Consulting
Table 45-3
Comment Type TR Comment Status D
Incorrect base text for Table 45-3. IEEE Std 802.3bw-2015 has 1.17 listed as a single reserved row because 802.3bw defined 1.18. No need to change reserved rows except 1.17. The new reserved row in this draft also conflicts with definition of 1.19 in P802.3by.

## SuggestedRemedy

Change editorial instruction to simply read, Change the 1.17 row of Table 45-3 (as modified
by IEEE Std 802.3 bw ) as shown below. Only show 1.17 row in Table $45-3$ changes with
Reserved in strikethrough and new register name and subclause underscore.
Proposed Response
Response Status W
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
REVISED
See suggested remedy (copied below) to accepted comment r01-8.
Change the editing instruction to: "Change the reserved row for 1.17 in Table 45-3 (as inserted by IEEE Std 802.3bw-2015) as follows (unchanged rows not shown):"
in the row for 1.17 add "Reserved" in strikethrough font and underline "EPoC PMA/PMD
in the row for 1.17 add "Reserved" in strikethrough font and underline "EPoC PMA/PMD

| Cl 45 | SC 45.2.1 | P39 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Grow, Robert | RMG Consulting |  |

Comment Type TR Comment Status D Table 45-3
Incorrect base text for Table 45-3. IEEE Std 802.3bw-2015 has changed the reserved row in 802.3-2015 (what is includede in the current draft) to define registers starting at 1.2100.

## SuggestedRemedy

The 32767 should be 2099 in first (strikethrough text) and last (plain text) row of the changes. Add ("as modified by IEEE Std 802.3bw)" to the editing instruction to indicate where the correct base text is found.
Proposed Response
Response Status w
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
REVISED
See suggested remedy (copied below) to accepted comment r01-09.
Change the editing instruction to: "Change the reserved row for 1.1809 through 1.2099 in Table 45-3 (as inserted by IEEE Std 802.3bw-2015) as follows (unchanged rows not shown):"
in the first row change the strikethrough text to "2099"
in the last row change "1.1959 through 1.32767 " to "1.1959 through 1.2099"


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

SC 100.3.4.4.3

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

| Cl 100 SC 100.3.4.4.3 | P105 L51 | \# r01-18 | Cl 100 | SC 100.3.5.3.1 | P113 | L33 | \# r01-23 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Laubach, Mark | Broadcom Corporation |  | Laubach |  | Broadco | tion |  |

## Comment Type TR Comment Status D

The first xref second/last sentence should point to Table 100-9
SuggestedRemedy
As per comment
Proposed Response Response Status w
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

| Cl 100 | SC 100.3.4.6 | P109 | L 42 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Laubach, Mark | Broadcom Corporation |  |  |

Laubach, Mark
Comment Type $\quad$ TR $\quad$ Comment Status D

In Table 100-11, change g.e. sign to "to" to match subclause text
SuggestedRemedy
As per comment
Proposed Response Response Status w
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
REVISED
Per comment.
NOTE: Range is 7.4 MHz to 204 MHz . The xref provides additional information.


Comment Type TR Comment Status D
Change "uses" to "can use". CLT needs to ensure that it meets a desired confidence
interval provided by the manufacture. For example, the statement as written would permit the CLT to use only one upstream probe symbol, which would not create confidence.
SuggestedRemedy

## As per comment

Proposed Response Response Status W
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

| Cl 100 | SC 100.3.6.1 | P114 | L 38 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Laubach, Mark | Broadcom Corporation | \# r01-24 |  |

Comment Type TR Comment Status D
Change ": <newline> For" to "and for" remove newline. Add a colon to the end of the sentence. Adjust row/line aligments.
SuggestedRemedy
As per comment
Proposed Response Response Status W PROPOSED ACCEPT.

| Cl 100 | $S C$ | 100.4.1 | P118 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Laubach, Mark | Broadcom Corporation | \# 48 |  |

Comment Type GR Comment Status D "MD1" should be "MDI"

SuggestedRemedy
As per comment
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

| CI 101 | SC 101.3.2.5.4 | P151 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Remein, Duane | Futurewei Technologie | \# r01-12 |

Comment Type T Comment Status D Burst Markers
Step 1) Add burst start marker and Step 9) Add burst end marker do not happen in FEC encoding. They are part of PMA.
SuggestedRemedy
In Step 7) change "codeword and move to step 9" to "codeword, exit."
In Step 8) change "step 9 else go to step 2." to "exit else go to step 1."
Remove these steps and renumber.
Proposed Response Response Status w
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
REVISED
See Response (copied below) to comment r01-25
Bin is defined in step 2: "the number of available 65-bit blocks (Bin)". Change the number step text to read as follows:

1) If the number of available 65 -bit blocks (Bin) is sufficient to fill a long FEC codeword (BQ $=220$ ), create a long FEC codeword. If Bin >= 220 remains true repeat step 1.
2) If $220>\operatorname{Bin}>=101$, create a shortened long FEC codeword.
3) If $101>\operatorname{Bin}>=76$, create a medium FEC codeword.
4) If $76>\operatorname{Bin}>=25$, create a shortened medium FEC codeword.
5) If $25>\operatorname{Bin}>=12$, create a short FEC codeword. If $\operatorname{Bin}>=12$ remains true repeat step 5 .
6) If $12>\operatorname{Bin}>=1$, create a shortened short FEC codeword.

| Cl 101 | SC 101.3.2.5.4 | P151 | L 13 | \# r01-25 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Laubach, Mark |  | Broadcom Corporation |  |  |

Comment Type TR Comment Status D Burst Marker
Bin is not defined. Looping may not be correct as drafted, i.e., should continue looping until not enough for a long codeword, move to next tests, etc. The text here should not be confused with the state machine / pseudo code used in 101.3.2.5.7, and should remain in its prior descriptive format.

## SuggestedRemedy

Revert to previous text, lines 13 through 39.
Proposed Response Response Status w

## PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

REVISED
Bin is defined in step 2: "the number of available 65-bit blocks (Bin)". Change the number step text to read as follows:

1) If the number of available 65-bit blocks (Bin) is sufficient to fill a long FEC codeword (BQ $=220$ ), create a long FEC codeword. If $\mathrm{Bin}>=220$ remains true repeat step 1 .
2) If $220>\operatorname{Bin}>=101$, create a shortened long FEC codeword
3) If $101>\operatorname{Bin}>=76$, create a medium FEC codeword.
4) If $76>\operatorname{Bin}>=25$, create a shortened medium FEC codeword.
5) If $25>\operatorname{Bin}>=12$, create a short FEC codeword. If $\operatorname{Bin}>=12$ remains true repeat step 5 .
6) If $12>\operatorname{Bin}>=1$, create a shortened short FEC codeword.

| Cl 101 SC 101.3.2.5.4 | P151 | L13 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Laubach, Mark | Broadcom Corporation | \# r01-22 |

Comment Type TR Comment Status D Burst Markers
Layer violation. Insertion of the start/stop burst markers is performed by the symbol mapper in the PMA.

SuggestedRemedy
Remove steps 1) and 12)
Proposed Response Response Status W
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
REVISED
See Response (copied below) to comment r01-25
Bin is defined in step 2: "the number of available 65-bit blocks (Bin)". Change the number step text to read as follows:

1) If the number of available 65-bit blocks (Bin) is sufficient to fill a long FEC codeword (BQ $=220$ ), create a long FEC codeword. If $\mathrm{Bin}>=220$ remains true repeat step 1.
) If $220>\mathrm{Bin}>=101$, create a shortened long FEC codeword
2) If $101>\operatorname{Bin}>=76$, create a medium FEC codeword.
3) If $76>\mathrm{Bin}>=25$, create a shortened medium FEC codeword.
4) If $25>\operatorname{Bin}>=12$, create a short FEC codeword. If $\operatorname{Bin}>=12$ remains true repeat step 5.
5) If $12>\operatorname{Bin}>=1$, create a shortened short FEC codeword
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